THE GOSPEL AND THE GREAT APOSTASY

PRIZE ESSAY.

Polem. 1164 h

Gospel

THE GOSPEL

AND

THE GREAT APOSTASY;

OR,

POPERY CONTRASTED WITH PURE CHRISTIANITY,

IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY AND SCRIPTURE:

ESPECIALLY WITH REFERENCE TO

ITS PRESENT CHARACTER AND PRETENSIONS.

Prize Essay.

LONDON:

THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY,
56, PATERNOSTER ROW, & 65, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD.
INSTITUTED 1799.

BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS.

PREFACE.

THE delicate task of introducing his work to the notice of the public has not been sought by the author, but laid upon him much against his inclination. Towards the close of the year 1850, his eye fell upon the following announcement in one of the papers of the day:—"To meet the urgent requirements of the times, the Committee (of the Religious Tract Society) offer a premium of £100 for the best Treatise on Popery, especially with reference to its Present Character and Pretensions. The work must be written in a popular style, with a special view to its circulation among the 'common people,' and must clearly point out the great leading errors of Popery, contrasted with the pure Christianity of the Bible. . . . . The book must be sound in argument, strictly correct in facts, powerful in its appeals, inter-

esting in style and illustration, and free from sectarian and political bias. . . . . The manuscripts will be referred to two adjudicators, by whose decision the Committee will be bound; with the distinct understanding, that the Essay selected as the best of those offered shall also be deemed by them to be worthy of the cause and of the Society."

To profess an attempt to fulfil these stipulations, except under the concealment of a literary mask, were the height of presumption. Nor would it be less presumptuous to assert now that they have been fulfilled. The responsibility has been shifted from the writer to his judges. It is to his mind a comfortable consideration, that between his otherwise defenceless person and the shafts of criticism, there is interposed the broad and veteran shield of that Society, under whose auspices he feels that he is unworthy to make this appearance.

During a residence of several years in Southern India, the author saw much of the practical working of the Church of Rome. The history of the proceedings of the Jesuits in that heathen land, among whom may be mentioned as one of the most distinguished in the arts of spiritual wickedness, Robert de' Nobili, has

left an impression on his mind so deep, as never to be effaced; and so painful, that the grief which has been excited is ever fresh. Besides, no one who is even a tyro in reading and reflection, can think of the facts of history or of the truths of religion, without finding that the web of his thoughts is at least one-half made up of threads spun by the agents of Popery. During the comparative leisure which the author enjoyed after his return from Madras, with the literary advantages of residing in the modern Athens, he addressed himself to the work proposed in the announcement quoted above, not so much expecting to succeed, as regarding it in the light of an athletic exercise; that, like a soldier in garrison, he might neither allow his weapons to rust, nor forget the use of them. Since it has been seen fit by the Lord of all to crown his labours with unexpected success, he feels all the more powerfully the propriety of ascribing to the Most High the undivided praise.

May it please the Father of mercies and the God of all grace, for his own name's sake, to add his blessing, that this imperfect effort may become instrumental, in some degree, in overthrowing error and establishing the truth,

advancing the kingdom of grace, and hastening the kingdom of glory. May it be read "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," that by its statements some weary, heavy-laden souls may find rest in Christ.

ALEX. LEITCH.

WIGTON, CUMBERLAND,
April, 1852.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I.

Popery Analysed and Defined 5

CHAPTER II.

The Historical Original of Popery 27

CHAPTER III.

The Conditions of the Argument between Popery and Pure Christianity 59

CHAPTER IV.

The Infallibility assumed by the Church of Rome, opposed to the Authority of the Word of God 82

CHAPTER V.

PAGE

Priestly Power and Papal Supremacy opposed to the Priesthood and Divine Prerogatives of the Lord Jesus Christ.. 110

CHAPTER VI.

The Sacrifice of the Mass opposed to the Atonement made for Sin by the Death of our Lord Jesus Christ 134

CHAPTER VII.

The Sacraments and other Rites of the Church of Rome opposed to Justification by Faith alone, and Sanctification by the Word and Spirit of the Lord..... 155

CHAPTER VIII.

Maxims and Practices of Popery opposed to the Moral Law . 180

CHAPTER IX.

Popery Predicted and Portrayed by the Pen of Inspiration . 218

Conclusion 238

Appendix 255

THE

GOSPEL AND THE GREAT APOSTASY.

INTRODUCTION.

THERE are some who would represent Popery as an exclusively religious system, and others who would exhibit it as almost entirely secular and political. Neither representation seems to be in harmony with the facts of history, or with the present position and pretensions of the church of Rome. The Roman pontiffs have invariably aimed at extensive political power, and have often attained and exercised it; but this has always been in subordination to the interests of superstition and priestcraft. The spirit of Popery has no sympathy with those who regard religion as a secondary matter in the business of life. The church of Rome cannot boast the chaste simplicity of worship observed in the Reformed churches, nor the purity of their morality, nor an orthodoxy as rigid as theirs; but her presiding genius detests and scorns the indifferentism, the secularity, the vassalage to the world, and the lukewarmness, which

2

have brought dishonour on not a few of the Protestant* churches of Europe. The coming of the Man of Sin, we read in the word of God, is "after the working of Satan," who is "the prince of the power of the air;" while several of the churches of the Reformation seem to have lost a large portion of the vigour of true religion. Some of them might be reproved for following the example of the church of Ephesus, and leaving their first love; others for having a name that they live, while they are dead, like the church of Sardis; and some for resembling the Laodiceans, who were neither cold nor hot. Were Popery to relax the grasp of the invisible world, which, in the estimation of her adherents, she holds through the medium of her institutions, and lose the influence thence derived over their minds, her whole framework would crumble into fragments and disappear. Deprive her, even for a short season, of her intense and pervading religious or superstitious elements, her priests

* It may be proper to state here, once for all, that this term is used in its modern acceptation—to denote all who, in the sixteenth century, rejected the tyranny of the Roman See, and renounced the unscriptural and the anti-scriptural dogmas, doctrines, and practices of the modern church of Rome. The appellation "Protestant" was first given to those sovereign princes and deputies of free or imperial cities in Germany who, in 1530, protested against the decree issued at the Diet held at Spires in 1529, as unjust and impious. We may hence perceive how unreasonable it is to call Protestantism, as has been done by Mr. Gladstone and others, a *merely negative religion;* for the protest now noticed was taken against a decree forbidding any change in the worship of the Mass till the meeting of a General Council; or, in other words, commanding the practice of idolatry for an indefinite time. The protest, therefore, was in vindication of one of the most precious privileges of humanity.

would forthwith lose their occupation, her treasury would never again be replenished, and her sceptre of political power among the nations would be broken. If this be the case, it is obvious that nothing but a rational and living piety, a world-overcoming faith, a religion purer indeed than hers, but as earnest, as thorough, and as untiring, such as animated and nerved the martyrs and early reformers, can successfully contend with her prowess or resist her advances.

It is desirable, but difficult, to unite the refutation of error with self-improvement. To expose an error without avoiding it, is a pitiable triumph. It is a rare victory to detest in ourselves the fault which we have detected in our neighbour. Although self-discipline and the exposure of error be perfectly distinct, they are not necessarily opposed to each other. But since the pursuit of each requires and generates a different temper of mind, they must be pursued separately. When engaged in controversy, a desire for victory, a sense of self-importance, and a mixed zeal for truth and for ourselves, are apt to occupy much of the heart, and leave but little opportunity for calm reflection and serious self-examination. When mingling in the turmoil of the battle, the soldier has neither leisure nor inclination to examine or arrange his accoutrements: the more self-reliance, even though it be unreasonable, the more valour. It is *before* the trumpet sounds the charge, that the warrior scrutinizes the state of his armour, and the grounds of his self-dependence. In like manner, it is proposed that we first

endeavour to describe and illustrate the errors of Romanism, with a view to our own improvement. The more intense our eagerness to uncover and disprove the fallacies on which Popery rests, the less jealous are we prone to be against their insidious operation in our own hearts, or in our own social circles. The more corrupt we persuade ourselves that Popery is, and the more successful we flatter ourselves that we have been in overthrowing her defences, there is danger that, in the same degree, the more reluctant we shall be to watch the rise of similar corruptions in ourselves, and the more disposed to fancy every contamination of the kind effectually escaped by simply keeping aloof from her communion. The abuses of the papacy have unquestionably happened for warnings, and ought ever to be regarded with a view to our own admonition. One mistake in our settled principles, or one flaw in our habitual motives, is of more moment to us than a score of heresies in our neighbour. We purpose, therefore, to treat our subject, *first—Analytically and historically*, with the object of promoting the benefit of Protestants, by endeavouring to set forth distinctly the leading errors of the Roman church, and at the same time to induce self-reflection as to the extent in which we may be entangled in these errors; and, *secondly —Controversially*, with the view of exposing by fair statements, and refuting by solid arguments, the gross corruptions of that church, and also vindicating the great truths of Christianity, which have thereby been obscured or denied.

CHAPTER I.

POPERY ANALYSED AND DEFINED.

"For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well."—ACTS xv. 28, 29.

POPERY presents an aspect so complicated, that it seems hopeless to understand it without attempting some analysis of the system. It is easy for any person of ordinary intelligence, with a little diligence, to make himself acquainted with the religion which is taught in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. But if it be asked, Where is Popery described and taught? the inquirer is referred, by the authorities of the church of Rome, not only to the Bible, but along with it, and as of equal authority, to the bulls of popes, the decretals, the acts of councils, and the Greek and Latin fathers. He is also referred to a mass of oral tradition, of unlimited quantity. This being the case, it is all but impracticable to obtain a complete and correct answer to the question, What is Popery? Not to speak of the difficulty of attaining know-

ledge through the medium of unrecorded traditions extending through many centuries, most men are unable, and few men are disposed to read papal bulls, which fill not less than twelve folio volumes—the canon law, which generally occupies two of goodly size—the acts of councils, which occupy thirty-one—and the Greek and Latin fathers, which fill thirty-five similar volumes. In casting a glance at those huge tomes, numbering three or four score, and attempting to scan such a mist of tradition, one almost involuntarily thinks of the decree of the apostolical council, quoted above, and is lost in wonder, and filled with delight, at the amazing contrast.

If any intelligent minister, or even member, of a Reformed church were requested to state, in few words, what is the sum of Christianity as taught in the Bible, he would reply, probably, by quoting some such Scripture as this: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," John iii. 16. But what, in a sentence or two, is the sum of Roman Christianity? The necessity of obtaining an answer to this question, even though it should be only an approximation to the truth, is apparent on the slightest reflection. Without some great distinguishing principle, or essential element, of Popery before us, to form a centre around which our thoughts and inquiries and arguments may cluster, how shall we investigate or discuss a subject, in connexion with which almost every principle in philosophy, every

doctrine in theology, every precept in morality, and every chapter in history, have been controverted? The student of the papacy has to tread the mazes of a labyrinth, where, unless he possess a clue, he is not unlikely to lose himself, while he gropes his way among the wonders of unnumbered miracles, the confusion of endless ceremonies, the intricacies of bulls, canons, and decrees, and the historical records of eighteen centuries, the whole being overshadowed by heavy clouds of unwritten tradition.

Moreover, an analysis of Popery is called for, that the system may be assailed to most advantage. To attack particular superstitions of Popery, without assailing its fundamental principles, can accomplish no more, even when the efforts made are most successful, than deprive this gigantic monster of some of his limbs. The true soldier of the cross would not only maim, but master, such a foe. The more prominent corruptions of the system must be assailed and demolished, one by one, and piece by piece, by bringing to bear upon them the musketry of the lines; but this task will be all the more easily and effectually achieved, if the citadel which covers the outworks be first dismantled by heavier weapons. Popery was not assailed in its most vital part till the days of Martin Luther. Before his time, many who continued within the pale of the church protested against flagrant abuses; and many others, for bearing testimony against the most manifest corruptions, were not only driven from her fellowship, but braved all her terrors, and paid the

last penalty that man can exact from man. Claude of Turin, Peter of Bruys, Arnold of Brescia, Valdo, Wycliffe, and many others, were noble champions of truth and purity in the ages of darkness; but by none of them was the axe laid at the root of the tree. They would have pruned it largely and unsparingly; one-half or more they would have cast into the fire; but they left the stock unassailed by a vigorous blow. That blow was dealt by the miner's son, but not intentionally. It was not Luther's object, at first at least, to uproot the hoary ecclesiastical tree, in which all the fowls of heaven had for ages nestled. He drew his bow at a venture, but the arrow from his string, under a higher guidance, pierced the heart of the beast. As he preached the gospel, every sentence he uttered was a deadly blow at Romanism, at the very time the preacher was bowing submissively to the authority of the Roman bishop. Not that the Saxon monk was the first to understand the glad tidings of great joy, but the truth fell upon his mind with a brighter ray, and he held it with a firmer grasp.

Further, it is desirable to grapple directly with the secret and pervading power of Popery, for the purpose of defending ourselves most effectively, both against its open assaults, and the subtle advances of its spirit. Many have been able to refute conclusively its grosser errors, and expose to ridicule its obvious absurdities, who, because unacquainted with the more recondite principles which form the hinge of the controversy, have been easily

baffled and discomfited by a skilful disputant, and even led captive by his artful devices.

It may be necessary to notice here an objection which may suggest itself to some minds. Of what use, it may be asked, will your analysis and definition be, unless they be perfectly correct; or unless Romanists agree with you in your description of the characteristic feature and vital element of their system? To which we reply, that the issue of the argument by no means depends upon our generalization being exactly true, or upon its meeting the approbation of our opponents. Though we should miss theoretical accuracy, we may successfully attain practical utility. If our general deduction be challenged, it may be granted that we have not put the point of our finger on the pivot on which the whole of the mighty machine turns; but we hope to make it manifest, that we have at least succeeded in putting our hand on the place where the pivot works. So near an approximation to correctness is enough for the practical purposes of understanding its general working, or stopping its operations.

We observe, *first*, as to the *general character* of Popery, that it must ever be regarded as a system founded upon the *religious* instincts of human nature. It has to do pre-eminently with the future world. Its right hand is a numerous, consolidated, towering hierarchy; its left, an endless routine of superstitious observances. It has, no doubt, won and wielded extensive political power; but whatever prominence may be given to this feature of

its character, facts unite with philosophy in leading to the conclusion, that civil dominion, however ambitiously sought and eagerly grasped, has been nothing more than an adjunct and instrument of its spiritual supremacy. Superstition, or "misdirected religious veneration"—an error into which all mankind are very prone to fall—lies at the foundation of Romanism, which may, therefore, be called a system of distorted devotion, or of perverted piety.

Most men admit that it is of infinite importance to each individual, that he worship God, and lay up for himself treasure in heaven. To neglect the wants of the body, and renounce its pleasures, is not only reasonable, but obligatory, if there were no more than a fair probability that, by doing so, the welfare of the immortal soul in the future world should be promoted. All our concerns in time shrink into less than a microscopic point before the high and measureless and enduring interests of our eternity. This is a fundamental article in religion. Popery acknowledges it fully, teaches it universally, enforces it urgently, and builds upon it her whole system. A living Protestantism rests on the same foundation. "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Mark viii. 36, 37.

The religious element in human nature, as opposed to the secular and selfish element, viewed in this its very general or natural aspect, and not as purified and directed by genuine Christianity,

has been as ably expounded and enforced by some Popish, as by the best Protestant writers; and it has been more vigorously developed in practice by the Popish, than by the professedly Protestant, church. It cannot be denied, that the adherents of Popery generally, spend more of their time, substance, and energies, in doing what they believe to be God's service, than is expended by Protestants in fulfilling what they know to be the commandments of God. The religious element in the former has degenerated, it will be said, into absurd, abominable, and cruel superstitions. But in the latter, might we not reply, has it not often evaporated altogether? The reformed orthodox faith may frequently be seen professed by individuals who are breathing selfishness, and clothed in worldliness, with scarce a trace of the working of an active, energetic spirit of piety. The subjects of the pope generally feel that they are dealing with the affairs of God, of the soul, and of eternity, according to their conceptions of these things, and dealing with them in earnest. No human being will endure the insolence and rapacity of a priestly tyrant, unless he feel "the powers of the world to come." The labour, the money of the Romanist is nothing; his religion is paramount—it is everything to him. Is it so to the same extent, and in the same degree, among nominal Protestants? Of too many of whom, may it not, alas! be truly said, that their religion is secondary to their business or their pleasure; to their politics or their philosophy? Are there not some who profess to

forsake all for Christ, and in truth forsake nothing for him?—who avow their belief that eternity is all in all, and heaven infinitely more than earth,—while it is plain, from the sickly languor of their piety, contrasted with the energy of their daily life, that to them, practically, time is longer than eternity, and earth better than heaven?

If there be aught to fear in the present advances of Popery, our weakness lies in the secularity of Protestantism. Whatever may be said by some to the contrary, Popery is an earnest and intensely religious system. Protestantism is in some places bewitched, unnerved, effete. A soldier who is drugged or asleep, cannot contend with the circumscribed yet determined movements, the blind yet effective strokes, of a cunningly-devised automaton, and may easily become its inglorious victim. When Protestantism becomes a mere shell, it will often crumble to pieces in the first grasp of a Roman priest. That Popery is only to be despised or ridiculed, is a sentiment surely indicative of an ignorant or irreligious mind. The system is not formidable enough in this day, and in our land, to occasion depressing dread; but it is wicked enough to excite our abhorrence, and mighty enough to exercise all our strength, and dangerous enough to awaken all our watchfulness.

Let us inquire, *secondly*, what are some of the more recondite and *distinguishing peculiarities* of Popery.

The precise nature of the Romish superstition may be best discovered by instituting an inquiry

into what constitutes the difference between it and other systems of religion or superstition. It will be found, we think, to be both *aggressive and intolerant* in the highest degree. By the former quality it is distinguished from every other false or corrupt system; and by the latter quality it is distinguished from the true religion. The religion of the Bible is aggressive, but not intolerant. Pure Christianity claims for herself the right to exercise universal sway; but enforces her claim only by strong arguments and meek persuasion. Idolatry has been intolerant in all ages, and in all climes, but never systematically aggressive, either in theory or in practice. Mohammedanism seems to be the only marked exception to our statement, that Popery alone has aimed at universal predominance, and sought to attain it by forcible measures; but the system as founded by the Arabian impostor, and extended by his successors, ought not to enter into the comparison, inasmuch as in it the political had a large preponderance over the religious element. The priests of Popery claim for themselves uncontrolled and unending power over the body and soul of every human being,—power to avert all evil, and to bestow every blessing, or to recall every blessing, and to inflict every woe; for one of the first principles of the system is this, that there is no damnation to the faithful within the church, and no salvation to those without her pale. The priests of the various forms of idolatry claim this power for themselves, but only over their fellow-countrymen or adherents.

The priests of each system, while vindicating their own supposed prerogative, allow the validity of a similar claim made by the priests of opposing systems. Mohammedanism has no priesthood, properly so called; and her caliphs claim no such power as that now spoken of—at least, over any but their own followers.* The ministers of the gospel teach that no man has the power of blessing or cursing his fellow-men, but that God only has. The claim of the Roman priest, then, is unique. It has never, in any age, or in any land, been made by any other party. It is plainly either the most important truth for man to know and believe, or the most daring falsehood which the world has ever heard. If we were called upon to characterize the system in a single sentence, it would be this: *Popery professes to be an institution appointed, sustained, and directed by God, promising the certainty of eternal life to all who shall consent to receive it through the hands of her officials, denouncing unqualified damnation on all beyond her pale, and assuming power to punish to the uttermost all her disobedient members.*

The power which Popery has assumed, she has unsparingly exercised. In looking back upon the history of many hundred years, language seems

* Abu-Bekr, the first caliph, in his instructions to the army, said, "Spare the inhabitants of monasteries; desecrate no houses of religious worship; cleave the skulls of the members of the synagogue of Satan who shave their crowns,—give them no quarter, unless they embrace Islamism, or *pay tribute*" (an alternative Popery never allows).—Taylor's *History of Mohammedanism and its Sects*, p. 155. London, 1839.

meagre and feeble, when we attempt to describe, in adequate terms, the ignorance which she has nourished, the impostures which she has invented, the impieties to which she has set her seal, the cruelties which she has inflicted, the immoralities which she has sanctioned, the perfidies which she has unblushingly practised, and the national revolutions and desolations which she has, by force or by fraud, effected. It is obvious to every one, that a system which has thus ruled the human mind through so many ages — which has been voluntarily embraced by the inhabitants of so many countries, and which came to maturity only after a long period of growth—must contain within itself some elements at once very plausible and very powerful. Its principles must touch every human heart, and touch them to the quick.. When we consider that there have been, and still are, connected and identified with the papacy, so many circumstances tending to repel, and alienate, and even horrify the mind, it is quite obvious that, as its power is unusually intense, its plausibility must be exceedingly attractive. It is a question of no small difficulty, but of no less importance, to determine the seat of this plausibility and of this power. It is not some shallow principle, nor a system of political tyranny, nor a lifeless machinery, nor an arrogant pretension, nor diplomatic chicanery, that has won the affections of so many hearts, and wielded the destinies of so many minds. Unless we can uncover the deep and hidden fountain whence have flowed for centuries

so many streams that have intoxicated so many millions of men, and spread desolation over human society, we shall be unprepared either to read with profit the history of Popery, to explain the phenomena of her existence and progress, or to resist her assaults and assail her strongholds.

The most careless observer of the popish system cannot fail to notice, that it mainly consists of a long train of ceremonies, a net-work of monastic institutions, and a concatenated hierarchy. A little reflection is sufficient to dispel the notion which might be the first to occur to some minds, that the victorious energy of the system lies in the *multitude* of her rites, in the *number* of her ascetic institutions, and in the *extent* of her towering priesthood. It were most unreasonable to adopt such a conclusion. The gigantic growth of her various institutes is plainly the *effect* and the *proof*, not the *source* nor the *cause*, of her plausibility to win, and her power to command. The character of any religion is never determined by the mere length of its ritual, nor by the larger or smaller proportion of its adherents, who, sickened with the world's vanity, abandon life's busy scenes, nor by the wider or narrower ramifications of its priesthood. It is precisely in this question as in chemical examinations: the *quantity* of any substance submitted to the action of a testing agent, affects, of course, the *quantity* of the result; but the presence of a single grain is found to be sufficient to determine the quality of the substance tested. In like manner, the world-wide develop-

ment and supreme dominion of Popery is to be explained, not by the quantity, but by the quality of her celibacy;* not by the number, but by the nature of her ceremonies; not by the prevalence or prominence, but by the pretensions of her hierarchy. In a word, *the secret of her strength and of her charms lies in the virtue which she claims for the vow of celibacy, in the efficacy which she attaches to the performance of her rites, and in the power which she places in the hands of her priests.*

Popery, while professing a high tone of religion, has acquired unspeakable influence by humouring the unworthy passions of humanity. One man will spend his wealth to gratify his senses; another will refrain from sensual enjoyments to accumulate riches. One man will sacrifice fame to selfish indulgences; another will abandon ease and comfort to establish his reputation. Popery adapts herself skilfully to every variety of disposition. She will sanction the pursuits of the ambitious man, if he will, in return, replenish her treasury; she will give her consent to the devices of the covetous man, if she be permitted to share in his successes; she never objects to the pleasures of the voluptuous man, if he will render her a substantial equivalent. Music, painting, and all the fine arts, are laid under contribution to lend their attractions to her spiritual sorceries. Thus she has the address, and employs the means, to obtain

* The reasons for giving the first place to asceticism are to be found in the exposition of 1 Timothy iv. 1—3, in the last chapter of the work.

universal deference and service. The mind of her victim may be in any state whatsoever; she has a remedy adapted to every want, and waiting to be applied. The mind may be excited with religious topics, or it may be treating them with neglect; it may be yearning after the future world, or be contented with the present. Her wiles will lull the sleeping soul into a profounder sleep; her ministers will drug the anxious soul with powerful opiates. She fixes, indeed, the price of her remedies, and the reward of her labour; but it is after a rate so well proportioned to the circumstances of her votaries, that every man, by a slight sacrifice, can liquidate her claims. Her arrogant pretensions seem to meet the urgent necessities of human nature; and to meet them immediately, easily, and economically. The guilty cry for pardon; she presents it without ambiguity, without abatement, and without delay. The unhappy call for blessings; she promises them certainly, cheaply, and eternally. The perplexed cry for direction; her doctrine of implicit faith removes or destroys every perplexity, for it possesses the wondrous property of converting at pleasure a sublime truth into a shallow truism, or a simple proposition into an inexplicable enigma. In a word, she feeds the imagination, misleads the understanding, gratifies the passions, stupifies the conscience, and thus exercises rule over degraded humanity.

While thus, as an incarnation of evil, she sways a powerful sceptre, her influence is augmented by

the assumption of the garb of truth. She provides visible substitutes for valuable and invisible realities; and thus, in the guise of an angel of light, betrays and ruins souls. Instead of the unseen and Divine Governor of the church and the world—the Lord Jesus—Popery points to a visible vicar, or vicegerent, in the person of the pope. Instead of the united, but unseen church, she exalts as infallible a society consisting of frail, foolish, fickle men. Instead of the perfect and risen Mediator, our great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God, she presents to the people, priests and mediators that are sinful, dying or dead. Instead of the efficacy of faith, which is mental and invisible, she has pushed into notice the pretended efficacy of sensible rites which can be tasted, touched, or handled. Instead of holiness of heart, which the eye of sense cannot scrutinize, she extols the purity of asceticism, which is only bodily and material. Because she wears, or attempts to wear, the white robe of Christianity, the religion of truth and of God, and uses so much of the truth as promotes her purposes, she has more power over the human spirit than any other false or corrupt religion. Because she has artfully substituted things sensible for things spiritual—the manual for the mental—sight for faith—her dexterous corruption of the truth has, to the blinded and perverted mind of man, more plausibility than the truth itself.

It has been eloquently said, "A heap of unmeaning ceremonies, adapted to engage the senses

and fascinate the imagination,—implicit faith in human authority, combined with an utter neglect of Divine teaching,—ignorance the most profound, joined to dogmatism the most presumptuous,—a vigilant exclusion of Biblical knowledge, together with a total extinction of free inquiry,—present the spectacle of religion lying in state, surrounded with the silent pomp of death." There is, indeed, too much of death's speechless and impressive grandeur hovering over a routine of senseless ceremonies—over prostrate intelligence—unhesitating confidence in priestly performances, and unmitigated mental slavery. These dark realities cannot be regarded as the funeral obsequies of *superstition;* they should rather be called its ripened fruits—its replenished store-house. They are not the monster's winding-sheet, but his ensnaring-net; not the appendages of his interment, but the weapons of his tyranny; but they *are* the funeral obsequies of true religion, of rational devotion, of doubting consciences, of awakened minds, of immortal souls.

We shall now endeavour, *thirdly*, to point out the more prominent *external features* of Popery, and to indicate the chief steps by which this pestiferous superstition attained such enormous dimensions.

The origin of Popery may be shortly described as follows. Somewhat too much weight was given to the rites of religion; this was conjoined or immediately followed by laying a little too much stress upon the desirableness or advantages of celibacy:

and these two were accompanied by a trifling increase of influence conferred upon, or assumed by, the ministers of religion. These three elements of evil having contemporaneously gained a footing in the Christian church (what more likely or more easy?), wrought and re-wrought upon each other, increasing the untoward influence of each, in circumstances favourable to the full development of all. Amidst this fermentation, and at a very early period, another evil made its appearance. A confusion of ideas existed as to the nature of the church visible and the church invisible; the church consisting of all professing disciples living on the earth at any time, was not realized as perfectly distinct from the church consisting of all the redeemed in the world of glory. These two totally different conceptions began to mingle in the minds of Christians; the ideas of purity and privilege which belong only to the invisible church, were at length attached without qualification to the church visible. This error, even from an early date, became the soil in which the other errors, like poisonous plants, struck deep their roots; they grew apace within the inclosure of the Christian church; their branches began to interlace; the religious jungle rapidly thickened and extended, and moral and spiritual life gradually became extinct. The highest virtue attainable by humanity was represented to be a rigorous asceticism; the first duty inculcated upon every individual was attention to ceremonies; the chief and only hope held out to the guilty was in the unlimited power of a consecrated priest.

The professing church, though steeped in immorality, began to boast of being arrayed in the immaculate robes of the saints made perfect, and to claim infallibility; and a necessity was felt for the government of one living head, to bind together the otherwise loose materials of this portentous agglomeration.

The above is the view that may be obtained of the rise and growth of Popery, by the inquirer who follows the stream of time. Let us now endeavour to retrace our steps, and contemplate the same objects, as we proceed back from the present to the primitive age.

In what, then, does the Popery of the nineteenth or of the sixteenth century consist? Let us first glance at the comparatively modern developments of the system. First may be mentioned the *universal celibacy of the clergy*, as enforced by law. This is only one of the matured fruits of the notion, that the single state is in itself, and irrespective altogether of the motives and dispositions of the individual, more holy in the sight of God than the marriage relation. Again, there is the *denial of the cup to the laity;* but this is a natural result of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is intimately connected with certain early notions entertained respecting the eucharistic rite, and which, therefore, though not in name, has in substance an ancient origin. Again, there is the *unlimited authority claimed by the pope* over the destinies of all men in both worlds; but this is an obvious pro-

duct of the augmented power and inflamed pride of a bishop of bishops; and the bishop's power has for its root, the undue authority assumed by the priesthood. Again, there is the *conducting of divine worship in an unknown tongue.* This absurd custom was introduced while the Latin tongue was gradually passing from the condition of a vernacular to that of an obsolete language, which after this transition was simply left unchanged in the church service; so that here we have no new element in the system. Again, there is the *prohibition of the Holy Scriptures from the use of the people.* It was, indeed, by the habitual neglect of the Scriptures, on the part of both priests and people, that corruption reached its bloated maturity; and then, as reviving life and purity in the Christian world began to draw arguments from the word of God, in defence of reforming doctrines against the church authorities, despairing tyranny resorted to the infatuated step of employing force as the easiest and most effectual method of answering the troublesome appeal. Again, there is the *increase in the number of the sacraments.* Now, if it be once admitted that the mere observance of the sacramental rite confers grace, it seems to matter comparatively little, so far as the interests of true godliness are concerned, whether there be two sacraments or twenty. Lastly, there is a whole swarm of *indulgences;* but these are only a new device added to many of an older date, which are fitted for nothing else, and seem to have

been intended for nothing else, than to replenish the coffers of him of whom it is said, that he can teach no error and can do no wrong.

The remaining palpable characteristics of Popery are of a much more ancient origin than those just noticed. There is the *doctrine of sacramental efficacy*, which is as old as the second century, and which, as it gained strength, gradually brought dimness and darkness upon the gracious and saving truths of the gospel. Then there is the *ascetic notion*, which assigns the highest place in morality, not to chastity, but to celibacy; not to the performance of duty, but to the practice of bodily austerities. This error is as old as the former; and as it extended its influence, it perverted and distorted the ideas of virtue and vice, and prepared the way for the obliteration of the line between sin and holiness. Again, Popery is distinguished by the *unlimited and irresponsible authority exercised by the clergy*, the germ of which is to be found in the post-apostolic age. Priestly pretensions soon acquired enough of vigour practically to displace the Lord Jesus Christ, in the estimation of the people, from his rightful position as the only High Priest appointed on behalf of our apostate race, and the sole Mediator between God and men. The conceptions of professing Christians on these three fundamental points,—the method of a sinner's acceptance with God, the law of morality, and the priesthood of Christ,—having become indistinct, loose, unsettled, and darkened, it is not surprising that so early as the fourth century corruption

should have reached a marked and lamentable development. Belief in the expiatory fires of *purgatory*, and in the efficacy of *praying for the dead*, and of performing *penances*, together with an idea respecting the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper which, in the popular mind, must have been very near akin to *transubstantiation*, was received by the universal Nicene church almost without a single protest. At the same time, the *invocation of saints*, especially of the virgin Mary, and the *worship of images* and of the *relics of martyrs*, were commonly observed, as essentials in religion, and as acceptable to God; while the *legendary and lying wonders* of St. Anthony afford only a fair specimen of the numberless similar fables which have been rehearsed and acted in the presence of millions during the long course of fifteen centuries, and some of which are still found to form a chief adornment of the pages of the Roman breviary.

Although many parts of the Roman system have no necessary connexion with each other or with Rome, yet it must be conceded, that its leading errors have a tendency, if not to generate, at least to foster one another. The evil principles to which we have adverted, are found combined together, and intimately blended, in fact, in the system of Popery; and it seems too much to assume that their association there is entirely fortuitous. If the union of errors as developed in the church of Rome be not the result of some hidden law, we know that it is the work of a mighty spirit:

"Then shall that Wicked be revealed . . . . . whose coming is after the working of Satan," 2 Thess. ii. 8, 9.

Popery, then, regarded as a system which has its plan laid down in certain voluminous documents, and its filling-up completed during a series of ages, is complicated, but not confused; vast, but not in disorder; girt with might, but not shrouded in mist. It is not a heap of rubbish, but a well-built, compact edifice; its foundations may be supposed to be formed of those deep convictions of the human mind that teach the existence of a supreme invisible Being, a coming judgment, and a long eternity; its numerous apartments, occupied with a variety of religious observances; its servants and guardians, a sacerdotal race who are at once the victims and the instruments of tyranny; its decorations, vice in the colours of virtue, and error with the proportions of truth; its chief corner-stone, papal supremacy; and its wall of circumvallation, which reacheth even unto heaven, ecclesiastical infallibility.

CHAPTER II.

THE HISTORICAL ORIGIN OF POPERY.

"The mystery of iniquity doth already work."—2 Thess. ii. 7.

Popery may be called emphatically *the religion of human nature;* for it includes within its ample inclosure the elements of every other false religion. It is the *most fully developed* form of misdirected religious sentiment; for it has not only combined all the elements of superstition, but has also given them the largest scope to operate. It is the *most delusive* form; for, while thoroughly and incurably corrupt, it assumes the name, and to some extent wears the garb, of the only true religion. And hence, among all other systems, it is the most ruinous to the best interests of men, and most dishonouring to the only living and true God.

The chief characteristic of the true religion is the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, received by faith; the chief characteristic of every false religion is righteousness by law or by works. "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain," Gal. ii. 21. Salvation flowing from grace, and embraced by faith, is opposed to

salvation founded on merit, and achieved by effort; Divine righteousness gratuitously received is opposed to human righteousness dearly purchased. The religious instinct of human nature has, in the course of ages, and in different lands, assumed two very distinct and erroneous manifestations. The one has prevailed more in the east, and the other in the west. The one degenerates into Pantheism, denying to the Deity his personality; the other degenerates into Polytheism, denying to the Deity his moral attributes. The one prevails chiefly in Buddhism; the other in Brahminism, or the popular religion of Hindostan. The one has most attractions for the meditative or philosophic classes in the dark places of the earth; the other, for the heathen masses of mankind. The one tends to the doctrine of absorption into the Deity, which is to be attained by bodily emaciations; the other, to the doctrine of a sensual paradise, which is to be purchased by penances and offerings. The one assigns merit to abstinence; the other to action. In the one, there is sentiment without service; in the other, service without sentiment. The one is mystic and ascetic; the other, formal and ceremonial. Asceticism sets aside the moral law, by attaching the notion of virtue to what is not virtuous, under a religious pretext. Ceremonialism sets aside the fear of God and the doctrines of grace, by attaching spiritual efficacy to the performance of an outward rite. When the spirit of religion evaporates amidst a multitude of ceremonies, many are tempted to become devout to the neglect of duty; and when

dreamy, passive sentimentalism reaches its height, many are tempted to resolve all religion into the mere observance of a ritual.

Christianity sprang into existence, and attained some maturity, in a soil deeply saturated with both kinds of superstition. The learned and meditative class were imbued with the Gnostic philosophy; and the mass of the people were sunk in a debasing idolatry. Both the evil tendencies, by which Satan has contrived to rule the nations of the world, early insinuated themselves into the vitals of the Christian community. Human righteousness, both with its mystic delusions and its cumbrous formalism, succeeded, at an early period, in darkening and displacing, in the Christian church, the righteousness "which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith," Phil. iii. 9.

We shall now endeavour to trace, first, *the influence of asceticism in the Christian church;* secondly, *the influence of ceremonialism;* thirdly, *the influence of priestcraft;* and, fourthly, *the influence of the theocratic church notion.*

ASCETICISM, OR MYSTICISM.

The morality of the professing church was, at no great distance from the apostolic age, deteriorated and distorted through the influence of the ascetic notion. Mosheim, in describing the characteristics of the second century, makes the fol-

lowing remarks: "Certain Christian doctors, either through a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or in consequence of a natural propensity to a life of austerity (which is a disease not uncommon in Syria, Egypt, and other Christian provinces,) were induced to maintain that Christ had established *a double rule of sanctity and virtue*, for two different orders of Christians. This double doctrine produced, all of a sudden, a new set of men, who made profession of uncommon degrees of sanctity and virtue, and declared their resolution of obeying all the counsels of Christ, in order to their enjoying communion with God here; and also that, after the dissolution of their mortal bodies, they might ascend to him with the greater facility, and find nothing to retard their approach to the supreme Centre of happiness and perfection. They looked upon themselves as prohibited the use of things which it was lawful for other Christians to enjoy, such as *wine*, *flesh*, *matrimony*, and *commerce*. They thought it their indispensable duty to extenuate the body by watching, abstinence, labour, and hunger. They looked for felicity in solitary retreats, in desert places, where, by severe and assiduous efforts of sublime meditation, they raised the soul above all external objects and all sensual pleasures. Both men and women imposed upon themselves the most severe tasks, the most austere discipline; all which, however, the fruit of pious intention, was, in the issue, extremely detrimental to Christianity. These persons were called Ascetics."

It is an undoubted fact that the ascetic doctrine was adopted almost universally by the church, both by its doctors and members, in the course of the third century. The New Testament teaches that austerities are only praiseworthy when they are practised for the kingdom of heaven's sake, and that the profession of celibacy is to be restricted to those who are able to receive it. (Matt. xix. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8.) But the sentiment of the early church was altogether different; it was in spirit opposed to the Divine rule, and in practice subverted the teaching of our Lord and his apostles. For it attached to the ascetic life a special kind of virtue, merit, or holiness, which was altogether unattainable by those mingling with society, however pure and exemplary their conduct might be.

This sentiment may be called immoral, not because it was a direct transgression of the moral law, but because it unsettled and confused the notions of men respecting the integrity and authority of the whole decalogue, as a rule of life binding upon all men. It is impossible to introduce in this place even a small portion of the evidence that might be brought forward, to prove the deep and dangerous and universal influence of this error in the Christian community, at a very early date. As many as ten thousand nuns are said to have belonged to one city; armies were levied from among the self-exiled inhabitants of the wildernesses; and, indeed, all the more devout and piously inclined withdrew from social business and domestic homes. To convey

some idea of this point to the general reader, we shall lay before him one or two statements from the pen of an author who has made the study of the writings of the Christian fathers the business of his life. Such as may desire more ample information, as undoubtedly many will, we refer to the work from which we quote. Abundant testimony will there be found to confirm the statements now adduced. This testimony as to the early corruption of Christianity, though exceedingly painful in itself, stands unimpeached by any party, and is to the very same effect as that which is frequently brought forward by the advocates of the Romish church in defence of its peculiarities.

"We place ourselves then at Carthage, where we find the good Cyprian,* an eminent, but miserably mistaken man—the victim of his times, and a martyr, first slain by the Gnostic error, and then by the Roman sword;—Cyprian, not indeed blaspheming God's constitution of human nature in the domestic economy, but fatally overthrowing it, and sapping its foundations, and turning off from the home circle all the purifying efficacy of Christian motives, while he lauds virginity as the only *substantial* virtue, the virtue of angels. At the same time, he labours to give practical effect to this pernicious doctrine, by fomenting the dangerous excitement which led young women to aspire to these high honours. With the natural and inevitable consequences before his eyes—consequences fatal, as he acknowledges, to the piety of many, and to the

* Cyprian suffered martyrdom A.D. 258.

honour of the church—he goes on to urge and to exaggerate this pestiferous delusion. It went forward. All, in their turn, lent their aid to promote it. Augustine followed, and with all his might defended and applauded holy virginity, the celibacy of the clergy, and the ascetic doctrine.

"Whatever may be the licentiousness prevailing in modern Catholic countries, I believe that the decorum of public worship is rarely violated; and, on the contrary, that an imposing solemnity and deep abstraction characterize, generally, the behaviour of those who attend mass. The scenes which Chrysostom* speaks of as of ordinary occurrence at Antioch and at Constantinople, would not, I think, be tolerated now in any church in Europe.

"The plain fact is, that this hinging article of ancient Christianity, after having been from century to century embodied in a less compact form, and its usages enforced with less rigour, and after having, in this loose form, ulcerated the church in a frightful manner, was at length brought into some order by the strenuous hand of authority, aided, indeed, by the mad fanaticism of certain fiery spirits. The venerable doctrine of the merit of religious celibacy has proved itself to be utterly impracticable under any conditions less severe than those which have, since the middle ages, rendered the religious houses, when vigorously governed, dens of cruelty and despair. But then, nothing can be more inequitable than to charge these

* Chrysostom's decease occurred A.D. 417.

horrors upon Romanism. The church of Rome has done, in these instances, *the best it could* to bring the cumbrous abomination bequeathed to it by the saints and doctors and martyrs of the pristine age, into a manageable condition. And if we are to hear much more of the 'corruptions of Popery,' as opposed to 'primitive purity' (in this particular), there will be no alternative but freely to lay open the sewers of the early church, and to allow them to disgorge their contents upon the wholesome air." (*Ancient Christianity*, by Isaac Taylor, vol. ii. p. 67; vol. i. pp. 370 and 78.)

The unhappy influence of this vicious sentiment may be easily conceived of by any one, and is amply unfolded in the pages of history. Wondrous legends have been invariably found in connexion with monasticism. Monks have always proved the most prolific authors of pious frauds, and have been most ingenious in finding excuses or palliations for transgressing the laws of God. Accordingly, even in the second century, we find Christians practising deceptions for professedly religious purposes; and there are not wanting traces of the distinction between offences pardonable by the church and those unpardonable; or, in other words, mortal and venial sins.

Another and inevitable result of the ascetic doctrine was this: When the virtue of the ascetics began to be universally extolled by the clergy, and believed in by the people, the mass of the people soon felt themselves occupying an inferior platform of holiness; and this consciousness of moral deprecia-

tion induced, as might be expected, much recklessness of deportment. Feeling that they had little to lose, they were less careful to retain what they possessed. When a youth has been incarcerated for the first time, and for some petty theft, it most generally happens that his self-respect is fatally wounded: he feels that he has passed the boundary of virtue, and plunges forward into greater crimes. So was it with the bulk of the people in the palmy days of asceticism: they felt themselves morally degraded in the presence of an anchorite, and were thus prepared for almost any excess.

Another consequence of the ascetic theory was the gradual introduction of clerical celibacy. If the opinion, that those who enter into the marriage relation are necessarily less holy than those who do not, be once embraced, how directly may the inference be drawn that the latter are *best* qualified to minister in sacred things; and another inference will soon follow, that they *only* are qualified. As ascetic prejudices gained ground, it is easy to understand how, while a first marriage might be tolerated in a priest, a second would be regarded as damaging to his priestly character. We find evidence of this state of feeling at an early date. Tertullian, who flourished A.D. 210, gives expression to the following sentiment, when speaking about the contraction of a second marriage: "The altar of God ought to be kept pure." *

From the same cause, the motives to martyrdom were early injured, and even debased. When

* See Appendix A.

Christians are called to suffer persecution, it is necessary to meet the fiery trial not only with firmness and joy, but also with meekness and humility. Many of the confessors of the early church, however, were destitute of these latter qualities, and even courted the sufferings which they should have shunned, so long as it was practicable to do so with a good conscience. Those who had endured hardship in the cause of Christ, soon became a privileged class—a kind of knights-spiritual. In this we witness a painful and desolating effect of a departure from the simplicity and purity of the law of God and the first principles of the gospel. When Christian men, who had everything to fear from their pagan persecutors, abandoning their homes and families, voluntarily exposed themselves to a cruel death, instead of using every means within their reach humbly and honourably to escape it—courted and coveted the cross and the stake, under the persuasion that they were thereby acquiring not only an extraordinary. degree of sanctity, but also a treasure of supererogatory merit, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that their notions of virtue and vice, of sin and holiness, had become essentially deranged. These self-devoted martyrs, let it be remembered, were first praised and venerated, and then, after no long interval, supplicated and adored, by the Christian world.

It is thus apparent that a broad foundation was soon laid within the church on which might rest all the immoralities of Popery. Let it be once conceded that simple fasting is in itself meritorious,

irrespective of the motive by which it is prompted; that it purifies the soul, and brings it nearer to God, and the way is open, the progress is easy and natural, to the most horrible self-inflicted tortures that have ever flowed from this insanity of the human mind. For, according to this principle, the greater the amount of self-imposed pain, the higher is the degree of piety attained. And the man who, under the idea of pleasing God, can excruciate and lacerate his own flesh, is prepared, if the interests of religion should seem to require it, to execute any barbarities on the bodies of his fellow-men. Let an individual once learn the lesson of setting aside a law of God under a religious pretext—let him once fairly assume the position of dispensing with duty on the plea of devotion, and he has already passed the edge of that lofty sloping descent, at the bottom of which may be found all the indescribable enormities and atrocities of the cloister, the conclave, and the inquisition.

If the devotees and fakirs of India, and the monks and nuns of Italy, could be convinced of this one truth, that abstinence from natural bodily enjoyments is not itself meritorious in the sight of Heaven, and that celibacy is no purer or holier than marriage, the jungles would immediately cease to be inhabited by "suny â sees," while the nunneries and convents of the west would be unable to retain in bondage the bodies of those whose spirits were thus emancipated. The high walls of these establishments would only stimulate the restored spirit

of humanity to assume a loftier bearing, and their triple gates would supply a threefold argument to vindicate long-lost liberty.

Let us here pause simply to ask, Is there no trace of ascetic doctrine in Protestant communities? Are there no individuals who will overlook, or leave undischarged, toilsome and humbling, but imperative obligations, in pursuit of apparent religious sentiment and forced devotional excitement? Are there none who can defraud their neighbour of his due, while they give a large donation to a benevolent object? Are there none who are breaking the first law of Christ's kingdom—brotherly love—under the plea of serving God, by defending the purity of worship, or the integrity of truth? Are there none whose love is waxing cold, because iniquity abounds; who are relaxing their holy self-denying zeal and activity to benefit others, because difficulties and disappointments multiply in their course, and are disposed to sink into a sort of soofeeism—a dreamy sentimental devotionalism?

CEREMONIALISM, OR FORMALISM.

The doctrine of *sacramental efficacy* is precisely the same in substance as the polytheistic notion which has prevailed so extensively, and which ascribes a mystic but real virtue to the observance of religious rites. This error, so natural to the human mind, is undoubtedly the germ of all idolatry and priestcraft. Even in the second century, rites

and ceremonies were considerably multiplied in the Christian church, with the view, it is said, of conciliating the heathen, and of rendering Divine worship more striking to the outward senses. The multiplication of rites was not so much an evil in itself, as the indication of the presence of another and a deeper evil. "It appears by many and undoubted testimonies," says Mosheim, "that this holy rite (the Lord's Supper) was looked upon as essential to salvation; and when this is duly considered, we shall be less disposed to censure as erroneous the opinion of those who have affirmed that the Lord's Supper was administered to infants during this (the second) century." The consecrated bread was sent from the communion table to the houses of the sick and absent members of the church, that they might not be deprived of the blessings which were believed to reside therein. The ordinances of the New Testament were soon known by the name of mysteries, an appellation belonging by immemorial custom to pagan rites.

This fallacious and pernicious opinion spread deeply its roots among the different Christian sects. About the middle of the third century, the North African church generally received the notion that baptism was unconditionally necessary to salvation. Ambrose of Milan, whose death occurred about the year 397, is related to have engaged passionately in prayer before the people on behalf of the soul of the Emperor Valentinian, who had died unbaptized, or, as it was then expressed, uninitiated, unregenerate, unjustified. The practice of delaying

baptism till the hour of death was founded upon the sacramental doctrine, was very common even at an early period, and was exemplified in the case of the Emperor Constantine. It was a common usage observed by persons about to travel, to take with them, as a sort of charm, a portion of the consecrated bread from the Lord's table; and it has been left on record, that the brother of Ambrose of Milan, when exposed to the calamity of shipwreck, reposed more confidence in the mystic efficacy which he believed to reside in the consecrated wafer which was tied about his neck, than in the aid he might derive from a good plank of the broken ship.

"Although a man," says Chrysostom, "should be foul with every human vice, the blackest that can be named, yet, should he fall into the baptismal pool, he ascends from the divine waters purer than the beams of noon." The same father turning toward those who, even during the hour when the rites of the "dreadful and mystic table" were celebrating, lounged their time away in idle company, and who, in doing so, belied the profession they had just made in taking part in the liturgical language, says: "Art thou not afraid, dost thou not blush, to be found a liar at that very hour? What! the mystic table has been prepared; the Lamb of God for thee is slaughtered; the priest for thee contends; the spiritual fire from the sacred table ascends; the cherubim holding their stations about, the seraphim hovering around, and the six-winged veiling their faces, while for thee all the incorporeal

orders, along with the priest, intercede. . . . . Not as bread shouldest thou look at that (bread), neither esteem that (cup) as wine; for not like other aliment do these (elements) descend into the draught. Far be it: think no such thing; for just as wax, held to the fire, suffers no detriment, as to its substance, although melted all away; in like manner, hold it to be true, that the substance of the mysteries is absorbed by the body (of the participant): wherefore, when ye approach (the table) think not that ye receive the divine body as from the hand of man; but rather as was the fire from the tongs of the very seraphim given to Isaiah."* Let any one attempt to distinguish between the view of the eucharist here stated by Chrysostom, and transubstantiation; and though philosophical minds may be able to observe and retain a distinction, it will be admitted by most, that such a distinction is altogether inappreciable by the people at large. It seems, moreover, to be obvious that the doctrine of the Nicene church, and that of the middle ages, equally tended to fix the gross apprehensions of the multitude upon the mere ceremony, to the practical exclusion from their regards of all that is spiritual in Divine worship.

The direct effect of the sacramental doctrine, when once it is admitted, is *to remove the truths of the gospel from their rightful place.* When the "tremendous mysteries" most filled the public eye and the public mind, faith in Christ, and the other doctrines of grace, though not formally

* See Appendix B.

excluded, were left to occupy an inferior position; though not theoretically questioned or denied, they were practically undervalued and neglected. If the sentiments of the members of the church become fairly infected with this error, the glorious gospel has its brightness obscured, and its might enfeebled.

It has been said by a popular and talented writer, when describing the growth of Popery, "Salvation no longer streaming from the now hidden Word, it was held to be transmitted through the medium of *humanly*-invented forms; and that none should possess it, unless received through that conveyance." But the spirit of Popery is subtler and stronger than here represented. Salvation may be, and in fact was, effectually and completely withheld from the mass of the people, before the word of God was prohibited by authority, and before ceremonies of human invention had overlaid the church. When the notion, that there is a mystic and spiritual efficacy in the mere physical observance of *Divinely*-sanctioned forms, and that there is no other medium, or none so good, of obtaining God's favour but these forms,—when this notion obtains prevalence, these forms will become "ineffable mysteries," and will assume such an amplitude and importance, in the estimation of the common people, that they will practically take precedence of the Holy Scriptures, and the truths therein taught. The victims of such delusion, while possessing—and, it may be, perusing—the Bible, do not expect salvation

through belief in its statements; and while boasting, it may be, of their detestation of humanly-devised ceremonies, are nevertheless expecting to attain eternal bliss through the punctilious performance of external rites, which, though instituted by God, were not intended by him for such a purpose. Such an expectation cannot but be regarded as irrational, irreligious, and dangerous.

Another direct tendency of the ceremonial doctrine, is *to cherish, if not to induce, irreverent feelings and immoral practices.* There is scarcely a page in church history that does not afford an example of the truth of this remark; and the reason of it may be easily explained. The due observance of ceremonies, especially when numerous, is more or less irksome; when it is over, and the conscience is besides thereby relieved and eased, the individual feels at liberty to please himself. The slave who toils day after day, most reluctantly, for the profit of an unfeeling master, will indulge freely in jest and mockery at the expense of his tyrant, when he unbends among his fellows, and the dread of the lash is removed—knowing full well that, if his daily task be but performed, he has nothing to hope or fear. So the man who yields himself a slave to ceremonial observances, who binds the welfare of his soul to their due and regular performance, not unfrequently feels his situation to be full of annoyance and degradation. When his routine work is finished, he does not hesitate, in a temper savouring of revenge, to cast his jeers and sarcasms at priest and

penance, at the altar and its god; believing, most assuredly, that if the outward rites be but scrupulously discharged—and of this he takes good care—his felicity is infallibly secured. Hence, the loosest morality, and the lowest profanity, have been observed in union with the strictest pharisaism, and the most rigid ceremonial sanctimoniousness.

There is *a close and obvious connexion between the doctrine of sacramental efficacy, and the veneration of the relics of saints, especially those of the martyrs.* If the word of God seem to invest the Heaven-appointed rite with a peculiar solemnity and sanctity, the providence of God seems to confer a similar distinction upon the relics of the martyred faithful; if it be once believed that the grace of God flows through the one, it is not difficult to believe that the honour of God is intimately connected with the other. It is, moreover, an easy step from the adoration of relics, to the invocation of the saints to whom they belonged. The idea, indeed, that mental and spiritual blessings are attached to material and visible objects—that the performance of a bodily act forms the link of sympathy between the soul and God—that heavenly grace, if not itself physical or corporeal, is affianced and wedded to things that are seen, tasted, and handled—is the very essence of all idolatry. Let an intelligent man so far renounce his intelligence as to allow himself to be persuaded that the Divine *favour* resides in a sensible object, and he may easily be brought to

believe—if the same influences continue to act upon his mind—that some spiritual and superior being resides there.

Here we cannot but pause for a moment to suggest the reflection, Is there no working of ceremonialism in Protestant communities, different in shape, but the same in substance, as that of heathen and Romish idolatry and superstition? The former is, doubtless, more subtle, but not on that account less powerful than the latter;—less apparent, but not necessarily less dangerous. Are there few who substitute in religion the outward and visible act, for the inward and invisible grace? —the profession of the faith, for its possession?— the words of the lip, for the utterances of the heart?—the minstrelsy of music, for the melody of the affections?—the bending of the knee, for the prostration of the spirit before the Most High? Is there no formalism in Reformed Christendom, which, by disjoining religious services from heartfelt and practical devotion, changes the natural food of piety into its poison; which, allowing the precious perfume of faith to evaporate, prides itself on the possession of the empty vessel which contained it? The doctrines of baptismal regeneration and sacramental grace are rife enough in the land; nor is there any want of an orthodoxy, as cold as it is clear, as hard as it is logical, and as unproductive in good fruits as it is unassailable in criticism; nor are there few who mistake pulpit oratory and declamation, for the power of truth and godliness—the empty applause

of a crowded pew, for the realities of penitence and obedience. We cannot stop at this point; our principle carries us much farther, and pierces more deeply. The discharge of any duty—and every moment of our time has its own weighty obligation, according to the import of this Scripture, "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God"—the discharge of any duty,—which, in truth, just means the performance of any action—for, "whatsoever is not of faith is sin"—from any other motive than a pure and predominant religious one, is ceremonial punctiliousness—is formality—is idolatry.

Mysticism and formality are, no doubt, found working more or less among the members of every protestant church, for they are the plague of every believer's heart; but while these errors, with their various ramifications, are incidental to the Reformed churches, they are essential parts of the papacy. The seeds of corruption, which are natural to humanity, are everywhere developing themselves, in spite of the pure and spiritual influences of genuine Christianity. The church of Rome, having lost these influences, has made it her business to pander to the weakness and vices of fallen man. The Bible, which is the religion of Protestants, exposes, condemns, and, when believed and obeyed, gradually eradicates, the evil tendencies of our nature. These, however, notwithstanding this counteraction, too often give painful evidence of their energy and vileness, in the best of men, and in the churches constituted

most nearly after the Scripture model. Popery has this pre-eminence in wickedness, that, instead of opposing the errors into which all men are prone to fall, she has systematized, sanctioned, and, after her own fashion, sanctified them.

SACERDOTALISM, OR PRIESTCRAFT.

In the word of God, the name "priests" is applied to the ministers of the Jewish and heathen religions, but never to the ministers of the gospel. The essential characteristics of the priest's office are to offer sacrifices, and to make atonement and intercession for the people. The priesthood of pagan nations, and of the Roman church, and the ministry of the gospel, are not merely unlike, but, in the most essential points, even opposite. The difference is well stated in the language of Archbishop Whately:—"*They* offer sacrifices for the people: *we* refer them to a sacrifice made by another. *They* profess to be the mediators through whom the Deity is to be addressed: *we* teach them to look to a heavenly Mediator, and in his name boldly approach God's mercy-seat themselves. *They* study to conceal the mysteries of religion: *we* labour to make them known. *They* have, for the most part, hidden sacred books, which none but a chosen few may look into: *we* teach and exhort men to study the word of God themselves. *They* strive to keep the people in darkness, and to stifle inquiry: *we* make it our

business to enlighten them. *They* practise the duties of their religion, instead of the people: *we* instruct and admonish all to practise them for themselves. *They* in general teach that a devoted confidence in them, and obedience to their commands, will serve as a substitute for a moral life: while *we* declare to them, from Scripture, that it is in vain to call Jesus Lord, if they do not the things which he says."

A priesthood is the invariable companion, if not the consequence, *of the doctrine of sacramental efficacy*. Since the office of the Christian ministry is so dissimilar to, and so alien from, that of a priest, whence, it may be asked, was the latter introduced into the Christian church? It was borrowed, according to the opinion of some, from Judaism; according to that of others, from heathenism. When anything is borrowed, it is to serve a purpose similar to that for which it has been already employed. The chief support of priestcraft in the world is its facility in ministering to the necessities of guilt-stricken man, by offering sacrifices, and presiding over mystic ceremonies. When the church embraced the error of attaching grace to the sacraments, irrespective of the motives of the participants, there was a craving for a priesthood, and a priesthood began to appear. The proneness of the people to confide in mysterious observances, and to substitute the devotion of the priest for their own, is not so much the consequence as the cause of priestcraft. Priestly influence could never have

existed, far less triumphed, unless there had been on the part of the people, not only a readiness, but a morbid desire, to be deluded. Livy observes of the ancient Romans, that holy impostures were always multiplied in proportion to the disposition of the people to swallow them. A priest of the Romish church, when taxed with some of the monstrous frauds of Popery, replied, "The people wish to be deceived—let them be deceived." Aaron urged in his defence a similar excuse: The people "said unto me, Make us gods, which shall go before us," Exodus xxxii. 23.

It is a most instructive fact, that the idolatry of Israel at the foot of Mount Sinai, one of the first and most striking departures from purity of worship, was not forced by the priest on the people, but suggested by the people, and culpably adopted by the priest.

Clerical ambition has sometimes been represented as the principal cause of Popery. A careful perusal of history would rather lead us to this conclusion, that the greater portion of the furniture of the popish superstition was not directly invented by the priest to prop up his illegitimate power, but proposed and supported by the perverted dispositions of the people. That the popish system was preconcerted, even in its rudest outlines, by any human being, is altogether improbable, though it may have been pre-arranged by a fallen spirit. It is the gradually developed product of false principles, concurred in by general society. Both priests and people incurred censure

by willingly yielding themselves to the influence of the current but false opinions of the day in which they lived; and every one that allows himself to become the victim of a prevailing error, gives it a fresh impulse in its desolating progress. The corruptions of Popery crept into the church one by one: they are weeds which grow spontaneously in the soil of human nature. The greater part of them originated with an ignorant and depraved populace. Though the priests did not create, they readily enough cherished them. They may not have manufactured, but they modified and brought them to maturity. These corruptions, having been suggested and solicited by the people, then connived at and consecrated by the priests, ministered to the base superstition of the one, and to the profligate ambition of the other. (See Jer. v. 31.)

Soon after the apostolic age, the distinction between clergy and laity was introduced, and gradually led to the formation of a sacerdotal caste. Although there were priests among the ancient Greeks and Romans, they were not separated from the rest of the community by a well-marked line, as is the case in the Mosaic institutions, and in the Romish church. It is most probable, therefore, that the *idea of a priesthood was more immediately derived by Christians from Judaism; but the derivation is most illegitimate.* The house of Aaron was typical of our great High Priest, Jesus, the Son of God, and ceased for ever to hold office after Christ had offered up himself. Even so early as the second

century, bishops were sometimes called chief priests. The bishop was gradually elevated above the presbyter. Above the country bishop soon rose his brother of the city; above the latter was elevated the bishop of a province; and above him rose the metropolitan, or patriarch.

Many circumstances contributed to increase the priestly power. At first, ministers were liable to be removed at the pleasure of the congregations over which they presided, without any fault on their part, which led, by a natural reaction, to a consolidation of their authority. As the slaves numbered one-half of the population of the Roman empire, there is reason to believe that many of the primitive Christians were in that depressed state. Congregations composed for the most part of such unformed characters, were not likely to be successful in maintaining a well-regulated freedom, or in resisting the encroachments of power. Persecution, by exposing the bishops to greater danger than the rest of the flock, and rendering them the natural resort of the oppressed, tended to confirm their influence, and exalt their position. In the ecclesiastical synods, the voice of the people was from an early period excluded. Cyprian, in his opening address before the council of Carthage, dwells at some length upon the privileges of the bishops, and their equality one with another, but is silent with respect to the rights of the presbyters and people. The rapid multiplication of church offices also led to an accumulation of power in the hands of the higher ranks of ecclesiastics. One of the most

striking facts that can be adduced, indicative of the rise of sacerdotal authority, is found in the character of a spurious compilation, called the "Apostolic Constitutions." These writings belong to the fourth century; but no doubt manifest the state of feeling in the century previous. They have for their chief and almost only object the increase and consolidation of the priestly power, to subserve which they draw their arguments from the Jewish law.

THE THEOCRATIC NOTION OF THE CHURCH.

To set this point in a distinct light, we shall avail ourselves of the statements of two able authors—one belonging to this country, and the other to Germany. As the conclusions which we are endeavouring to set forth, throughout this chapter, are supported only by facts of ancient history, which it is impossible to insert in such a treatise as this, we earnestly recommend every reader to take some other opportunity of studying them. And since these conclusions come with much weight, when expressed in the language of the men who by the laborious study of the ancient writers have felt them impressed upon their own minds, the following quotations are worthy of special attention:—

"The legal education and dialectic habits of Tertullian, as well as his natural sagacity, made him perceive more clearly, and perhaps sooner than

others, that practices such as those involved in the discipline and order of celibacy, could not be maintained or enforced, even after perverse ingenuity had done its utmost in the way of exaggeration, without the aid of some general principle, such as should bear any weight that might be thrown upon it, and which the Scriptures alone could not be made to sustain. We therefore find him very deliberately going to work to lay this necessary foundation, whereon might be reared—and whereon, in fact, has been reared—a vast and ever-growing superstructure of superstition, human devices, and tyrannous canons. 'Scripture is of God'—these are the words of Tertullian—'nature is of God; discipline (usage or custom) is of God; and whatever contradicts these, is not of God. If in any case Scripture be ambiguous, nature is indubitable, and sustained by its testimony Scripture cannot be uncertain; or if there were yet any doubt concerning the evidence of nature, the discipline (usage of the churches) which is more directly authenticated by God shows the way.' Is, then, this fundamental church axiom a good one? Is it true, or not, that Christianity, as revealed and verbally expressed in the canonical writings, is a mere sketch or rough draught of that mature truth, which by little and little was to be granted to the church, through the medium of its doctors, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit? If so, then is there anywhere else we can look for the progressive expansion of this ever-growing truth, but to the church of Rome, or, if we like it better, to the

Greek church? We here find the broad principle formally asserted, which might not merely underprop the discipline of celibacy, but sustain all other additions to the Christianity of the Scriptures, and, in fact, give solidity to whatever constitutes the mass of abominations summarily called Popery."—(*Ancient Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 92—94.)

"We observed already, in the preceding period (namely, the first three centuries), how, from confounding the ideas of the visible and the invisible church, from the notion of a necessary outward unity of the church, the idea had sprung up of an uninterrupted outward representation of this unity, necessarily existing at all times; and how this idea had been transferred to the *Cathedra Petri* in the Roman church. This idea, handed down in its yet vague and unsettled shape to the present period (extending from A.D. 310 to 590), in connexion with its root, the false and grossly-conceived Old Testament view of the theocracy, contains within it the entire germ of the papacy, which needed nothing more than to unfold itself, under favourable circumstances, in the congenial soil of the spirit of an age in which the confusion of the outward form with the inner essence became continually more inveterate.—Optatus of Mileve, who wrote in the last half of the fourth century, represents the apostle Peter as the head of the apostles, *as the representative of the unity of the church* and of the apostolic power, who had received the keys of the kingdom of heaven for the purpose of giving them to others. He finds it worthy of remark, that Peter, notwith-

standing that he had denied Christ, yet continued to hold this relation to the rest of the apostles, so that the objective side of the unity of the church, *which was thus incapable of being invalidated by any human fault*, appears in its unchangeable constancy." (Neander's *General Church History*, vol. iii. p. 222.)

By uniting this church axiom, which is enticingly plausible, but intensely false, to the undoubted and highly important truth, that our religious concerns should take the supreme and controlling position among the affairs of human life, there stands disclosed the occult power, the very life of the papacy. This idea about the church rises very naturally in the mind; for the church, consisting, as it does, or ought to do, of the worshippers of God, the disciples of Christ, should be one and undivided. And the church being no doubt visible, this unity should also be visible. If the church lose its order and unity, it might as well, one would think, be annihilated altogether. But in such a world as this, how can disorder and dissolution be avoided without the presidency of a powerful head? Hence it will seem to follow, that the church must be Divinely regulated as well as Divinely constituted, and that apart from the church a man has no access to God, and God's blessing descends not on man. According to this theory, the church being the only channel in which grace flows from heaven to earth, it forms the only medium through which man can obtain the favour of God.

But this view of the church is profoundly erro-

neous. Visible unity, though necessary to the church's comfort and efficiency, is not essential to her existence. The church is not the medium by which men approach to God; but the assembly of those who have come to God through Christ. The church is not the channel through which pardoning grace flows to the guilty, but the congregation of those who, through faith, have been pardoned. The church consists of those who, loving God, are loved by him; and hence it is easy to fancy, or affirm, that whoever wishes to enjoy God's love must seek it through means of the church: whereas, the reverse of this statement is true; namely, that no one is at liberty to join the church, nor are the ministers of the church at liberty to receive any one, till he has entered into the Divine favour and fellowship, by the exercise of "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

We have thus seen, from the records of history, that within three or four centuries from the institution of Christianity, abstinence from enjoyments sanctioned by the providence of God, and not forbidden by his word, was generally reckoned by professing Christians of more importance in the sight of Heaven than purity of the affections and holiness of life, and that thus lax views of morality extensively prevailed. We have also seen that, at the same time, an undue and superstitious importance, or, rather, a marvellous and Divine efficacy, was attached to certain signs or simple acts, which, apart from the facts that they com-

memorate, and the truths that they suggest, are destitute of all value, and that thus the doctrines of grace—justification by faith alone, and sanctification by the word and Spirit of the Lord—though not forgotten, nor doubted, nor denied, were removed from their due prominence, having their glory shaded and their transcendent worth depreciated. We have further seen that, contemporaneously with the growth of these two errors, a priesthood was established, who, besides taking under their absolute control the rites of religion, now swollen with exaggerated import, added to them many more of human invention; and being driven onward, on the one hand, by the craving and clamours of a degenerate people for legends, miracles, and varied sentimental and sensuous excitement, and drawn forward, on the other hand, by their own restless ambition, readily connived at and sanctioned the veneration of relics, the invocation of saints, praying for the dead, lying wonders, and diversified idolatry. And we have also seen how a church theory was formed and espoused, according to which the continual guidance and assistance of the Holy Spirit being claimed for the office-bearers of the church, prevailing usages came to be regarded as the best interpretations of the word of God, or as possessed of equal authority with that word, and that thus the way was prepared for making ecclesiastical customs the supreme law of the Christian community. The nominal church having fairly entered on such a course as this, perhaps less than prophetic wisdom might

have been able to declare that, if she were left to herself, the end would prove what it has, alas! proved—a loathsome swamp of immorality, an intense darkness of error, and an awful abyss of impiety.

CHAPTER III.

THE CONDITIONS OF THE ARGUMENT BETWEEN POPERY AND PURE CHRISTIANITY.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."—1 THESS. v. 21.

THE students of Popery cannot avoid the disagreeable necessity of engaging in controversy; as the philosopher, in exploring the phenomena of nature, cannot escape the toil of travel, the dangers of the mine, and the inclemency of the storm. The unpleasant and unprofitable asperities of controversial writing may be in some measure excluded or softened, if the subjects of debate and the rules of discussion be clearly stated, and mutually understood and acknowledged. When the controverted points are luminously defined, mists and shadows are less likely to hang over and becloud the field of argument. When the laws of legitimate controversy are perspicuously stated, candidly acknowledged, and faithfully observed by both parties, the logical contest is less likely to be disagreeable, or its immediate results unsatisfactory; while there will be greater facilities for the truth being clearly vindicated, and her pure and precious blessings fully developed and widely disseminated.

Seeing that the topics now to be considered are so great in number, so various in matter, so pregnant with the highest interests, and so warmly controverted, they should be approached only by a mind intensely humbled before the majesty of God, and deeply impressed with a sense of personal responsibility in the conclusions to be reached. To be satisfied with imperfect information and insufficient reflection on such a subject, and then to form an opinion lightly, and hold it loosely, is to pursue a course fatally detrimental to the purity of truth, highly dishonouring to the dignity of the mind, and eminently dangerous to the destinies of men. Since it is the common opinion of Romanists, that there is no salvation out of their pale of the church, and since it is the common opinion of Protestants, that in this controversy, "Christianity itself, with all its blessings, temporal and eternal, is opposed to a fatal illusion, wearing its garb, and an infernal tyranny wielding its terrors"—it was not unreasonable in Luther, who had formed his opinion deliberately and devoutly, to exclaim, when accused of too much vehemence, "Oh! were it mine to choose, my testimony should be no other than the voice of thunder, and every word should fall like the fiery bolt." But since it is no less the dictate of wisdom than the oracle of Heaven to speak "the truth in love" (Eph. iv. 15), no one can profitably engage in this discussion, unless his mind be thoroughly imbued with that charity which "suffereth long and is kind,"—"is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but

rejoiceth in the truth." While we believe that it can be proved on the best and fullest evidence, that Popery is a system replete with every circumstance fitted to excite "alternate scorn and horror, alternate laughter and tears;" and though it be vain, as it is perhaps undesirable, entirely to proscribe the use of ridicule and sarcasm, as weapons in this warfare, yet the weighty interests involved seem imperatively to demand that these be used with a discerning eye and a sparing hand; for when they are most effective in calling forth merriment and disdain, they are often least successful in promoting truth and godliness.

We now solicit attention to two or three preliminary principles of special importance to the right management of this high argument, in which the glory of God and the happiness of the human race are so immediately and deeply involved.

1. To determine *the true character of Popery*, in theory and in practice, *the only legitimate appeal is to her own authoritative standards, and to the impartial page of authentic history.* To assail the system at once fairly and effectively, arguments or instruments of assault should be directed, not against such shifting or indeterminate outworks as the private opinions of this bishop or that cardinal, but against the measured and unchanging position occupied by papal bulls, the decrees of general councils, accredited creeds and catechisms, official oaths, and universally-observed liturgical services. It were unreasonable to regard the opinions of Fénélon or Pascal, of Dr. Doyle or Dr. Wiseman,

as it is equally unreasonable to regard those of Loyola, Robert de' Nobili, or some Spanish inquisitor, as a fair representation of Popery. We look to the opinions of the popes and eminent doctors of the church, whose sentiments, stereotyped in the church's symbols, have been the guiding principles of the church's proceedings. A review of the Romish system as her foundations have been laid in her symbolic books, and her proportions developed by historical events, will satisfy any candid mind that it has ever been her leading object to attain absolute dominion over the consciences and property of men;—to reduce the entire world, Christian and heathen, under her sway. This object she has continually pursued, not only with unslumbering zeal, but also with consummate skill, and the largest success. She has been careful to suit her plans to every change in her position, and to improve to her own advantage every circumstance that could lend the smallest aid. These tactics she has followed so unscrupulously, that, besides deeply obscuring, without formally extinguishing, the light of "the glorious gospel of the blessed God," she has never hesitated to break the commands of Heaven, and trample on human laws, when such measures seemed to be for the time expedient.

But not only is there a broad and important distinction to be observed between the private views of certain advocates of Popery, and the statements of her authoritative symbols—between the representations of some of her friends, and the unques-

tioned facts of her history; it is also to be noticed, that it is not always prudent to trust to the interpretation or translation of her symbols which may be given by some of her adherents. The appeal lies to the ecclesiastical standards themselves; and, having these documents of ultimate reference in our possession, we claim the liberty of judging for ourselves what is their import. In refusing sometimes to adopt the meaning which may be attached to the standards of the Roman church by individuals or bodies of men in her communion, we receive support from a bull issued by pope Pius IV. That pontiff has forbidden all ecclesiastics, not excepting bishops, from publishing any interpretation of the decrees of the Council of Trent, which are the latest, and not the least important, of the church's standards, under the penalty of incurring "the wrath of God Almighty, and his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul." * We shall adduce an example of the want of integrity or exactness in translating important statements which are given to the people for their instruction. In the book known as the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which was prepared at the request of that council, but never received its sanction, not having been completed till after the council was dissolved, and which, nevertheless, has been always regarded by Romanists as of the highest authority, we find it asserted, that "heretics and schismatics are not in the church." Immediately after these words, it is

* See *Bulla S. D. N. Pii* IV. *Canones et Decreta Sacrosancti Œcumenici Concilii Tridentini.* Lipsiæ, 1846, p. 220.

added, "It is not to be denied, however, since they are in the power of the church, but that they may be summoned by her to trial, punished, and condemned by an anathema."* As it is not considered advisable always to avow, especially in this country, the persecuting principle here laid down, the word rendered above "punished," has been sometimes tampered with. For example, in a translation of the Catechism published at Dublin in 1816,† it is omitted, and the reader is left under the impression that it is not in the original. In another translation published by Donovan, one of the Maynooth professors, in 1829,‡ it is rendered, "visited with spiritual punishments," the word "spiritual" being gratuitously introduced, and obviously to serve a purpose.

Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, in the seventeenth century, wrote a work entitled, "An Exposition of the Roman Catholic Faith," which was regarded by the pope as so imperfect, that for nine years he withheld his approbation. The book, however, was so clever, and so likely to promote the interests of Rome, that the sanction of the papal court was ultimately obtained for its publication. The Sorbonne first disavowed, but latterly adopted, the views of this "Exposition." Of this celebrated work it has been well said, "It is as far removed

* *Catechismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini.* Lipsiæ, 1847. Par. i. cap. x. qu. viii.

† See *Reformers' Library*, No. V. page 338. London, 1833.

‡ See A *Protestant Memorial*, by the Rev. T. Hartwell Horne. London, 1835, p. 92.

from Popery on one side, as it is from truth on the other. The religion which it sets forth consists of a number of subtle distinctions much too delicate to be observed in practice. It would be easier to pass over the bridge of the Mohammedans, as narrow and sharp as the edge of a scimitar, in the passage to the other world, than to go to heaven in the successful observance of Bossuet's metaphysical niceties, if these were to be the price of paradise. Constantly to pray to the saints, with the perpetual conviction that they do not hear us with their own unaided powers; and to pray in the presence of images, with the imagination excited by them, and yet with the firm belief that no virtue resides in them, were a superstition too complicated and contradictory for the inventor of it himself to practise and observe." *

2. While neither the private opinion of any one or more individuals in the Roman communion, nor their interpretation or translation of the church's standards, is to be always received as a correct representation of the popish system; it *were obviously unfair*, on the other hand, *to charge any individual Romanist with a belief in doctrines which he disavows, or with the guilt of actions in which he takes no share, and which he disapproves in others.* It is a historical fact that while Popery has acknowledged as her faithful sons some of the basest men, her cause has been espoused by some of the noblest. Although Pascal was condemned by the bull Unigenitus, and Fénélon was ban-

* Douglas's *Errors of Religion*, p. 101.

ished, yet these pious and excellent men are to be regarded as the adherents and supporters of Popery during the greater portion of their lives. But since so few like-minded are associated with them, we may learn that it is not the natural tendency of Popery to produce men good and great. Nor can such distinguished characters be entirely exempted from blame for continuing their connexion with Rome. They might have learned from the Holy Scriptures, which they possessed and studied, the true nature of Popery, and their obligation to separate from its corruptions. The influence of habit or of fear, which retained them in their false position, may call forth some expression of pity, but cannot warrant entire exculpation. The higher their reputation, and the greater their virtues, the more pernicious has their example been in perpetuating the delusions of the Man of Sin.

Pope Hildebrand, one of the most energetic and successful in consolidating the power of the papal hierarchy, died in exile at Salerno, uttering these words: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore is it that I die in exile." "Who," adds the historian, "shall venture to charge with hypocrisy words spoken on the verge of the tomb?"* This concession is just, but it confers

* "The religious theory and polity (of Popery) could never have been imagined by minds of that inferior class which, with a consciousness of turpitude, pursue base ends by base means; on the contrary, spirits of the loftiest order, and these intensely affected by the most powerful motives which human nature can admit, and accustomed to grasp the largest ideas, were the authors of this vast scheme of government. Nevertheless, it was a scheme that could

emphasis on the conclusion, which we hope to be able to establish, that, while it were uncharitable folly to affirm that no Romanist can be saved, whoever subscribes the dogmas which indubitably and invariably characterize Popery, and approves the actions that naturally flow from these dogmas, and that have been always exemplified wherever the system has developed itself, is a perverter of the everlasting and glorious gospel, and an enemy to Christ and the souls of men. To believe otherwise were dotard charity, or the false liberality of undisguised scepticism.

3. Having settled, in the manner above indicated, what Popery truly is, it will be proper and necessary to *test the character and proceedings of those who defend, uphold, and disseminate it*, not only by their occasional professions and practices, but *by the nature of the system* whose cause they have undeniably and by oath espoused. The priests and bishops of the church of Rome know, or ought to know, what the real character of Romanism is;

not have been made to bear upon the social system without the constant co-operation of the cruel and the base. This, indeed, is the singularity of the papal superstition, that it has in every age brought into close alliance the noblest and the most abominable natures. The thorough sincerity and virtuous intention of many of the most zealous champions of the papacy may well be admitted. Alas! the condition of humanity! How should we commiserate, and how tenderly bear with each other, as the unconscious victims often of illusions! and how should each bring to the severest test his own conduct and convictions! The lesson of modesty and charity should indeed be gathered from the humiliating pages of church history. The pious and the upright we find; but where find those who have been altogether exempt from infatuations?"
—*Spiritual Despotism*, p. 294.

for it is their business to teach it to others. They strenuously support it, and swear eternal and unconditional submission to its rules. Who among them, therefore, can be honourably acquitted from the responsibility of concurring in all the evil which necessarily attaches to the system?

That the reader may have some knowledge of the solemn oaths under which Roman ecclesiastics come, we subjoin an extract from the creed of pope Pius IV., which is sworn to by every priest; and another from the oath of allegiance taken by every bishop:—

"I acknowledge the holy Catholic and apostolical Roman church, the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ. This true Catholic faith, *out of which none can be saved*, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold, and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life; and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached by all who are under me, or are entrusted to my care, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God!"*—*Creed of Pope Pius IV.*

"The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman church, of our lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be

* See Appendix C.

in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated, by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power, and as soon as I can will signify it to our said lord, or to some other, by whom it may come to his knowledge."*—*Episcopal Oath of Allegiance to the Pope.*

If it shall be found proved, after due and impartial examination, that certain priests and bishops of the Roman church have publicly and solemnly denied their belief in doctrines which, by an uncancelled oath, they are bound to believe and defend; that others have deliberately represented the system to which they belong, to be substantially different from what its own sanctioned and unrepealed standards affirm it to be; that some have designedly corrupted the records of history to advance the interests of their system; that others have feloniously forged documents for the same purpose; and that others still have misrepresented and perverted the facts of history, in order to mislead ignorant people, justice demands that such proceedings be characterized and condemned according to their merits. The evidence that might here be adduced to prove the existence of such "deceivableness of unrighteousness," is, alas! too abundant. As an illustration, we may notice a work (entitled, *A Treatise of the Corruptions of*

* See Appendix C.

Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the Prelates, Pastors, and Pillars of the Church of Rome, for the Maintenance of Popery. By Thomas James*), in which it is proved, that besides fifty specified corruptions introduced into the genuine writings of the fathers, one hundred and eighty-seven treatises have been forged by the adherents of Rome, and attributed to different fathers of the church, all of which contain statements that tend to support the doctrines and practices of Popery. It is admitted by Bellarmine, one of the greatest champions of the papacy, in one of his writings, that these treatises are forged; while in other parts of his works, he appeals to their authority in support of the invocation of saints, transubstantiation, the supremacy of the pope, and such like.† The celebrated Decretals is a case in point; but as their history is well known, we pass on to another example.

The aspersions that have been cast upon the character of Luther, are numerous and weighty. It has been often said that Luther was stimulated to pursue his course as a reformer, by resentment for the affront put upon his order by the pope, in withdrawing the sale of indulgences from the hands of the Augustine friars, of whom Luther was one, and committing it to the Dominicans. That this statement is purely calumnious, can be proved by the undoubted facts of history. The traffic in indulgences had not been usually entrusted to the

* Revised and corrected from the Editions of 1612 and 1688, by the Rev. John Edmund Cox, M.A. London, 1843.

† Bellarmine's *Works*, vol. vii. *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis.*

Augustinian monks before Luther's appearance as a reformer. This traffic, moreover, was so base in itself, and indeed generally reckoned so infamous, that it was refused by the Franciscans when offered to them. Besides, this charge against Luther was never whispered so long as he was in life, by any of his numerous enemies. Its origin can be traced to Cochlæus, an unprincipled writer, of whom even many of his friends were ashamed. This calumny, dressed up in various modes, and accompanied by others still more malicious, has been industriously circulated in many lands. It has been unceasingly propagated by the unscrupulous advocates of Romanism. For example, the jesuit Beschi, by whose talents and labours, in the beginning of last century, in Southern Hindostan, so many thousands changed their superstition, but not their character, gives it some prominence in a volume which he entitled *Bible Light*, and in which he attempts to defend Popery against the arguments and efforts of the Danish missionaries, who landed at Tranquebar in 1705. Beschi, however, is not satisfied with retailing this comparatively harmless slander: he represents the Saxon reformer as the impersonation of every vice. "You might as soon think," he says, speaking of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, "that a dead dog, corrupting, stinking, breeding worms, is the sun that gives light to the whole world, as that a heresy, produced and nourished in all sin, is the way of salvation" (p. 9). This instance is the more apposite, since the volume was published, in the Tamil language in which it was

written, so lately as the year 1842, at Pondicherry, under the authority of Rome.*

Having thus stated one or two rules, which seem of some moment in conducting this discussion, let us, before entering the lists with those whom we *must* regard as our opponents, and whom, therefore, we cannot avoid designating, however reluctantly, by that name, endeavour to examine, with some degree of accuracy, the relative circumstances of the two parties. In logical, as in other warfare, it is always profitable to reconnoitre the defences and weapons, as well as the position of the enemy.

First, then, as to *the nature of his defences and weapons*. There is a peculiarity attaching to the mode of reasoning usually adopted by Romanists in their discussions with Protestants, which is curious and instructive. The arguments which have been employed by Romanists in their own defence since the days of Luther, are not for the most part of ancient date; they were altogether, perhaps, unknown to the fathers of the Nicene period, and to a large extent were not used by the doctors of the middle ages. The tenth and twelfth and thirteenth centuries had an argumentative coin of their own, which was so base and so clumsy, that it has been prudently kept from the searching scrutiny of reforming times. For example, pope Innocent III., in one of his letters, says, "As God, the Maker of the universe, created two great lights in the firmament of heaven, the greater light to

* See Appendix D.

rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; so for the firmament of the universal church, which is called by the name of heaven, he has ordained two great dignities, the greater to rule our souls, which resemble days, and the less to rule our bodies, which resemble nights; which dignities are the pontifical authority and the kingly power. Moreover, as the moon receives her light from the sun, and as the former is truly less than the latter in quantity and quality, in position and influence, so the kingly power receives the splendour of its dignity from the pontifical authority." Again he says: "As to that scripture, 'Whether it be to the king, as supreme' (1 Pet. ii. 13), we do not deny that the emperor has supremacy in temporal matters, but only over those who receive temporal things from him. But the pontiff has supremacy in spirituals, which are more noble than temporals, inasmuch as the soul is to be preferred above the body." Again: "It is said in the Divine law, 'Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people' (Exod. xxii. 28); which, therefore, places priests before kings, calling the former gods, and the latter rulers." Again: "Christ has left to Peter not only the universal church, but the whole world to be governed; because, while the others came by boat, he threw himself into the sea and hastened to his Lord; and the sea means the world, as the psalmist says: 'This great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping innumerable.'" The same Innocent attempts to prove that Peter is the vicar of Christ, because, by walking on the

sea, he received universal power over all people.* Such argumentation as that of which a few samples have just been given, is worthy only of the midnight gloom of superstition, the frivolity of intoxicated pride, and the impiety of successful ambition. The fathers of antiquity were ignorant of its possible existence;—their would-be children of the present day are ashamed of its wild extravagance.

The peculiarity of which we speak may be illustrated in another way. The practice of praying for departed friends is very frequently explained and defended in the writings of Romanists by a reference to the doctrine respecting purgatory. But this kind of explication and argument inverts the actual order of historical events, and the natural order of cause and effect. It was the practice of offering supplications for the deceased, conjoined with certain Gnostic sentiments, that brought into the church a belief in the fires of purgatory. The latter was the offspring of the former; at all events, it could not by possibility be its cause, since it was later in appearing. The same remark applies to a large proportion of the Romish superstitions; in most of them the cause will be found substituted for the effect, and the effect for the cause. The words, "This is my body," were in

* The Letter of pope Pius III. to the Emperor Charles V., reproving him for his conduct in the Council of Spires, also illustrates our statement. The arguments used by that pontiff to convince a disobedient son, and to vindicate to his own mind, and the minds of his adherents, the papal pretensions, are mainly of a different stamp compared with those employed in the controversy with Protestants.

the mouth of every Christian for a thousand years, before the dogma of transubstantiation was fully developed, and before the term was invented. Men discovered the reasoning, or believed in its force, because they were passionately fond of the conclusion which it was employed to support. Hence, arguments which are destitute of all validity and weight, have obtained, during the lapse of centuries, the unqualified assent of all men. If a heresy spring from a misinterpretation of a passage of Scripture, a correct exegesis of the text would be enough to dispel the heresy; but when a perversion of Scripture is made use of to defend an already prevalent error, the error will remain after the text has ceased to have even the appearance of supporting it.

These observations lead us, we apprehend, to a conclusion of some practical value. The texts quoted in these days by the advocates of Popery, we have every reason to affirm, did not for the most part suggest the tenets which they are adduced to support; but on the contrary, they were in some instances diligently searched out, and always eagerly laid hold of, as the most plausible that could be found to uphold opinions already formed, and practices already established. The modern arguments in defence of Popery, therefore, are not to be regarded as the arguments which really give stability to the system in the minds of its adherents. They are all after-thoughts; a tissue of special pleading; only a foil to parry the blows of an adversary. The proofs from reason and from

Scripture which are at present current in the mouths of our opponents, have all been invented or grasped at to sanction what was settled beforehand, and have been employed with the effect, if not with the intention, of blinding the understanding to the waywardness of the heart, and reconciling the conscience to immorality and ungodliness too dearly loved to be abandoned. What then, it may be asked, are the actual weapons of our opponents? The means and arguments which have been most successful in consolidating and extending the system of Popery, are treachery with the simple, sophistry with the intelligent, boldness with the ignorant, and indulgence with the vicious. The agents of this superstition, in all ages, have in the basest and most abject manner become all things to all classes of men—except to one class. For there is only one class found in human society whose minds are proof, at one and the same time, equally against *deceit*, *flattery*, and *coercion*. Popery has triumphed over thousands by her *wiles*, and over thousands more by her *blandishments*, and over thousands more by her *terrors*. But there is one character, and only one, whom she cannot delude with her cunning, nor soothe by her caresses, nor constrain by her anathemas—the humble believer in Christ, the faithful follower of the Lamb. With him, therefore, and *with him alone*, she wages an irreconcilable, mortal conflict.

We have still to reconnoitre the *position* of our adversaries. A prudent general examines the situation of the fortress against which he is marching,

with the view of determining the best mode of attack. Some strongholds are most easily taken by storm, and others are more easily reduced by blockade. What, then, is the nature of the position which our opponents occupy? or, in other words, *What sort of errors are the errors of Romanism?* A scientific misconception is to be adjusted by additional experiments; a logical paralogism is to be amended by the aid of the rules of syllogism; a blunder in arithmetic is to be corrected by re-casting the sum; a mistake of the memory is to be rectified by referring to an authentic record. There are such kinds of errors in the Romish system, almost without number; but these form not its staple article. The errors of Popery are, not merely in their circumstances, but in their essence; not merely by inference, but directly,—*absurd, immoral, impious.*

Is this language unwarranted? Have not an assembly of sinful, ignorant, mortal men, designated by, but disgracing, the name of the church of Christ, asserted that they can never err? Is it not maintained that, in a succession of popes, through a decade of centuries—including the weakest, the obscenest, and the most cruel of mankind—each has been the vicegerent of the Lord Jesus Christ, wielding his holy sceptre, and exercising his unlimited and uncontrolled dominion? Are not all men called upon to believe and confess, under pain of damnation, that Christ's body and blood, soul and Divinity, are in each one of many thousands of wafers at the same time; and

that each wafer is to be adored as the very person of the Lord himself? Is it not taught in the Roman church, that without confession to a priest, there is no forgiveness with God; and that the worship of saints and images is innocent, comely, and profitable? With the lamp of history in your hand, examine the half-revealed abominations of monastic recesses; fathom the sea of blood which Rome has drawn from martyred millions, and doubt, if you can, that mad ambition, "though nursed on human gore, compared with her, was merciful;" examine the records, the offices, and the dungeons of the Inquisition, and modify, if you can, this description of its character—"model most complete of perfect wickedness;"—and all this perpetrated under the dazzling escutcheon and imperforate shield of the Divine attribute of infallibility;—(What edict of persecution has been recalled? what sentence of the holy office has been cancelled?) The soul is burdened with the hideous conception, as the world has long groaned under the dread reality.

If the extreme offences against reason, law, and religion be not found here, they are nowhere to be met with under the sun. There never has been, there is not, and we think there never will be, on earth, such another mass of what is degrading to intellect, opposed to purity, and dishonouring to God. It is, therefore, a preliminary question of no small importance, In what *mode*, and by what *weapons*, is it wisest and safest *to assail the fortresses of absurdity, immorality, and*

impiety? It is humbly yet confidently submitted, that it is not usual, in conducting the ordinary affairs of life, to *argue* and *debate* regarding errors of such a quality; for such a mode of procedure is neither prudent nor free from danger. Men will smile at absurdity, if it be harmless; they will coerce it, if it be mischievous: on no account will they condescend to contend with it in argument. There are few bad men so abandoned as to defend naked immorality by logic; and few good men so imprudent as to assail it with that weapon. If the first blush of impiety does not affect a man's conscience, and cause him to shudder, his reason cannot supplement the ominous deficiency, or remedy the fatal disease of his soul. In assailing Popery, therefore, which is the embodiment of absurdities the most ridiculous and the most mischievous—of immoralities the grossest and most unblushing—of impieties the most daring and the most profane—the facts of history alone, or the mere syllogisms of logic, or demonstrations as faultless as those of science, are as nothing—or they are only as a handful of earth wherewith to stem the swollen torrent, or as a rope of sand wherewith to bind leviathan.

We shrink not from entering the arena of facts and arguments with our opponents, under the confident persuasion, that we shall succeed in exposing some of the fallacies of their special pleading, in uncovering a portion of their sophistry, in breaking the foil they are disingenuously using, and in driving them from the outworks of their plausible

after-thoughts to the crazy, crumbling citadel of their first and yet more erroneous principles. But we shall not attempt to do so till we have entered our solemn protest, that—whatever may be the result of the argument in some of its details—we are led, with a force altogether irresistible, to the conclusion, that Popery is a system which our reason cannot but condemn, which our heart cannot but abhor, which our conscience cannot but execrate. In acting thus, we feel that we are falling back upon the principles of the highest and surest logic. The subtleties of the schoolmen distracted the mind of Galileo, and the terrors of the holy office overcame his firmness: his confession was uttered, but his conviction was unshaken; for the vital energy of truth shook off the dust of dialectics, and breasted the billows of fear, when he exclaimed, after his retractation, "Nevertheless it moves."* In like manner, while we would pray for the grace of God, that if our faith should ever have to pass through an equally searching ordeal, it may prove more victorious than that of the Florentine philosopher, we are still conscious of possessing soundness of mind to such a degree, that, although our opponents were able to produce what they cannot—a score of Gordian knots which no one could untie, and an involved tissue of ratiocination which no one could unravel,—we would spurn away from us, as palpable impertinence, every

* The sentence against Galileo, which was first published in 1634, was renewed and re-published in 1819.

statement adduced to support a proposition which, though its enormity be moulded into a fascinating shape, or concealed under a skilful disguise, is obviously, and in substance, equivalent to this, —that vice is not vice, or profanity is not profane. The very attempt to uphold such a proposition— and this is the attempt of every advocate of the Papacy—is in fact, if not in design, treason against the majesty of truth—the highest guilt or the weakest simplicity; and to proceed to the refutation of such a proposition without any preliminary protest or explanation, were an equal crime or an equal folly.

CHAPTER IV.

THE INFALLIBILITY ASSUMED BY THE CHURCH OF ROME, OPPOSED TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE WORD OF GOD.

STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.	DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.
"I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all the constitutions and observances of the church."	"The law of the LORD is perfect."—*Psa.* xix. 7.
"I also admit the sacred Scriptures, according to the sense which holy mother church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers."	"And he (Christ) said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition."—*Mark* vii. 9.
	"Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye enter not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."—*Luke* xi. 52.
	"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom."—*Col.* iii. 16.
"I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn and reject and anathematize all things contrary thereto; and	"From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in

all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church."—*Creed of Pope Pius IV. Parag.* 2, 3, *and* 14.

"But as this one church, because governed by the Holy Ghost, cannot err in faith and morals; it necessarily follows, that all other sects arrogating to themselves the name of church, because guided by the spirit of darkness, are sunk in the most pernicious errors, both doctrinal and moral."—*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, Pars i. cap. x. q. xvi.*

righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—2 *Tim.* iii. 15—17.

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.—*Rev.* xxii. 18, 19.

It is agreed on both sides, that the Bible is the word of God, and that nothing is binding upon men, as a doctrine to be believed, or as a duty to be practised, except that which rests upon Divine authority. The church of Rome, without professedly or entirely rejecting the authority of the sacred Scriptures, claims to be under the immediate and continual guidance of the Holy Ghost, and consequently infallible; maintains the high pretension of being the only legitimate interpreter of God's word; and asserts that her decrees and canons are possessed of supreme authority on earth.

The nature of this claim ought to be noticed before evidence is led either to establish or refute it. To ascribe the quality of infallibility in faith and morals, which is not so much one of the attri-

* See Appendix E.

butes of the Deity, as the essential condition of every Divine perfection, to any individual man, or to any aggregate, or to any succession, of human beings, is a position so inherently and palpably impious, that a devout man may well shudder, lest the very statement of it should pollute his mind. As a chaste woman scorns with all her soul, and spurns from her outraged presence, the wretch that dares to whisper in her ear an impure thought, so the true child of God, who has learned the beginning of wisdom, which is the fear of the Lord, will spontaneously repel, as he is bound to reject, the very first approaches of such a profane conception.

The *arguments usually adduced by Romanists to prove the infallibility of their church*, may be summed up under these three,—*prescription*, *necessity*, and *Scripture*.

The argument from *prescription* is this:—The doctrines of the church are true, because they are ancient, and have been transmitted from the apostles by an unbroken succession of bishops. To which it is replied, that paganism is more ancient than Popery (but our opponents will not allow that it is on that account more venerable); that it cannot be proved that the episcopal succession has been continued without dislocation; and that many of the present doctrines of the church are not found in primitive times, but are inventions bearing various dates.

It is argued further, that there is a *necessity* for an unerring guide in religion, and a judge in matters of controversy. To this we answer, first,

that the necessity alleged cannot be proved to exist; secondly, if it could be proved to exist to the satisfaction of man's judgment, it might not be so regarded in the judgment of God, who alone can appoint an infallible guide to the children of men; thirdly, admitting that God has seen and provided for such a necessity, it does not follow that he has done so by conferring infallibility on the church of Rome; fourthly, it can be easily proved that the conclaves and councils of Rome are among the last places where infallibility may be expected to reside; fifthly, even those who have conceded this preposterous claim to the Romish church have not thereby escaped from mutual misunderstandings, or from painful, protracted, and perilous differences of opinion; sixthly, it is at least as easy to understand the Bible, as the church's interpretation of the Bible. The people may misinterpret the church's infallible interpretation; and therefore, the only effectual method to prevent variety of sentiment or error in the church, is to confer infallibility, not on its priesthood alone, but on every one of its members. It may be added, that while the priesthood, who practically exercise the assumed prerogative of infallibility, are obviously exposed to many strong temptations, springing out of selfish and party interests, to induce them to pervert the statements of inspiration, the mass of the common people seem exempt from every possible motive wilfully to misconstrue a message from Heaven.

That mankind urgently need large assistance to understand the word of God, cannot be denied.

The weakness of man's judgment, and the waywardness of the human heart, loudly call for a Teacher and Guide in addition to the written word. This real and felt necessity is not met, but mocked, by the fiction of an unerring church; God meets and supplies this need in his own, which is a better way. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him," James i. 5. "If any man will [is willing to] do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God," John vii. 17. "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God," 1 Cor. ii. 12. An authoritative and infallible church can, at best, render men only believing machines; the sacred Scriptures and the gift of the Holy Ghost make men intelligent and holy believers.

Many Romanists are rash enough to appeal to *Scripture* in support of their views on this point. The dogma of the church's infallibility clearly sets aside the supremacy of Scripture; to assert, therefore, that that dogma is supported by Scripture, is only to add insult to insult. Men are first called upon to interpret Scripture only according to the judgment of the church, and then to trust the judgment of the church on the authority of Scripture. This most vicious sort of argument, called by logicians a circle, is one out of which it is impossible for our opponents to escape, and they may be lashed round it to the end of time. What! inclose the

sacred volume within unwarranted restrictions, and conceal the heavenly light behind the veil of an unknown language, and substitute a human version* for the Divine original, and then appeal to these same writings to sanction the proceedings by which they have been so unceremoniously dishonoured, so irreverently degraded,—there never was a more flimsy disguise for any affront offered to the dignity of the human understanding. "Such treatment of the Scriptures almost reminds us of the fabulous history of Jupiter, who ascended to supreme power by the mutilation and banishment of his father."

The *objections* that may be urged *against the dogma of infallibility*, which is really and avowedly antagonistic to the authority of the word of God, are numerous, varied, and, we think, conclusive. The following are selected.

If it be conceded that the Bible is the word of

* "Pope Sixtus v. having taken great pains to make a correct text of the Latin Vulgate, and revised every sheet himself, published it in 1590, with a bull prefixed, in which, 'of his certain knowledge and fulness of apostolical power, he decreed, that this was to be held as the only authentic edition of the Vulgate;' 'that it was to be received as true, lawful, authentic, and undoubted;'—forbidding in all time to come the publication of any edition which should vary in any respect from his, under the penalty of incurring 'the wrath of Almighty God, and his blessed apostles Peter and Paul;' while, in two years after, Clement VIII., who equally had 'certain knowledge and fulness of apostolical power,' published another edition, virtually superseding that of Sixtus, and varying from it in no fewer than two thousand passages."—See *Bellum Papale, sive Concordia Discors Sixti Quinti, et Clementis Octavi, circa Hieronymianam Editionem.* Auctore Thoma James. Nova Editio, e Recensione, J. E. Cox. Londini, 1840.

God, this concession necessarily includes the assertion, that *the Bible is possessed of supreme and unshared authority, ample sufficiency, and lucid perspicuity.* We cannot conceive of a revelation from Heaven "that must not be trusted alone." Whatever message comes from the great Creator to his intelligent creatures, will shine forth among all human sayings as the sun among the luminaries of heaven. To deny that the Bible is so supreme in authority as to admit no equal, so sufficient in matter as to require no addition, and so perspicuous in language as to need no interpreter, is to deny that it is the word of God. "What is Holy Scripture," (we quote the language of pope Gregory the Great,) "but an epistle from Almighty God to his creature?" If this epistle be not invested with unequalled and undivided authority, it is practically of no authority at all. If this epistle do not contain all information necessary for our duty here and our salvation hereafter, it cannot be a rescript from a Being of boundless love, almighty power, and infinite wisdom. If the contents of this epistle be not intelligible to all men, its arrival will only add darker hues to the perplexities, and disclose deeper depths in the unalleviated sorrows of the human race: it will seem more like a snare than a solace; more like the mockery of malice than the help of Heaven. Reason itself thus teaches us that a revelation from Heaven to intelligent and responsible beings such as men, and an infallible visible church such as that of Rome claims to be, are totally incompatible.

Again, *the word of God claims for itself a supremacy which excludes ecclesiastical infallibility.* This is indeed self-testimony, but of such a kind as is not only allowable, but unavoidable. If it be once satisfactorily established, that the Bible is an authentic message from God to men (and this has been proved by the most ample evidence, to which it is unnecessary now to refer, as the point is fully allowed by our opponents), it is not unreasonable to inquire what this book says of itself. The ambassador of a monarch at a foreign court, on receiving a document purporting to be a rescript from his venerated sovereign, proceeds to examine the seal and the signature, and to scrutinize the medium through which it reached his hands, in order to satisfy his mind that it is genuine. Having determined this point, he sits humbly down to its perusal, and unhesitatingly yields to it, whatever acts of submission it may claim. So, whosoever receives the Bible as the book of God, ought, with unfeigned and unexceptive submission, to learn from its pages what is the extent of its authority. The Holy Scriptures thus speak of themselves: They are able to make us wise unto salvation, and are profitable for everything necessary to make the man of God perfect, 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. They were written by holy men moved by the Holy Ghost, 2 Pet. i. 21. They are full and sufficient to lead to repentance unto life, Luke xvi. 29—31. They are an unerring guide, 2 Pet. i. 19. They are perfect to convert the soul, and designed to make the simple wise,

Psalm xix. 7. God's people keep them in remembrance—long after them—love them exceedingly—regard them as sweet—grieve when men disobey them—and stand in awe of them, Psalm cxix. 16, 82, 97, 103, 158, 161. They were written for our instruction, Rom. xv. 4; and are intended for the use of all men, Rom. xvi. 26. They work effectually in them that believe, 1 Thess. ii. 13. Our Lord sanctions the common use of them by all, by appealing in his teaching to their contents, Mark xii. 10—12. Everything should be tried by them, and all who search them are truly noble, Acts xvii. 11. They are to dwell richly in God's people, Col. iii. 16. The heaviest denunciations are pronounced upon those who add to them, or take from them, Deut. xii. 32; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

An intelligent inquirer will ask, *If the church of Rome be infallible, wherein does this attribute reside?* The only answer which can be given to this question, indicates the existence of an incoherent mass of folly. There are no fewer than twelve different theories held upon this vital point by Roman doctors. Some maintain that infallibility is lodged in the *church diffusive*, of whom a part assert that it is lodged in the body of the clergy; and another part, that it is found in the bishops, as the representatives of the church, though not assembled in a council: by all parties the people are excluded from any share. Others maintain that infallibility is found in a *council* consisting of all the bishops of the church; but those who hold this opinion are not agreed among

themselves. The naked decision of the council is opposed to its decision as clothed with the approval of the church. A numerous class of Roman divines believe that infallibility is found in the *union of a council and a pope;* but when they come to settle the manner of this union, diversity immediately appears. Some plead for a council *convened* by a pope; others, for a council *confirmed* by a pope; some for a council convened by a pope and sanctioned by the church; and some for a council confirmed by a pope and sanctioned by the church. Not a few look to the *pope alone*, as the reservoir of the church's unerring faith; but even these are far from unanimity of sentiment. Some of them contend for an official decision* of the pope alone; others, for such a decision received by the church; some, for the judgment of the pope when he is assisted by a few bishops; and others, for this judgment when supported by the church, which means the whole priesthood. It thus appears that the church, like an unnatural mother, has allowed her children to contend on this point, which is obviously not the least important in the whole argument, to an extent that has endangered her very existence, without even an attempt on her part to bring the dispute to a settlement either amicable or authoritative.

At the same time, *the church has not hesitated to elevate certain human compositions to a level with the word of God.* The infallible interpreter

* There is endless variety of opinion as to what constitutes an *official* decision of the pontiff.

and judge cannot be found, but his infallible interpretations and judgments are before us. If the heavy mist which, as we have just seen, hangs over the seat of the church's infallibility, and which certainly has no attractions of its own, prevented an exposure of the emptiness of the claim, we might admire the ingenuity of the contrivance; or if it be fortuitous, congratulate our opponents upon the lucky accident. But when an exposure cannot be avoided, seeing the boasted infallible opinions of the church are written, printed, and published, the assumption of exemption from error in such circumstances seems one of pure infatuation. From the extracts at the beginning of the chapter, we learn that the church of Rome regards apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, written and unwritten, all other constitutions and observances of the church, and all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent, to be equally true, equally profitable, and equally authoritative as the inspired word of the living God. It would occupy volumes to exhibit the mass of gross incongruities involved in this position. The mere statement of it is a sufficient refutation.

We may notice one specimen of the church's inconsistency, and we select what has an immediate bearing upon the present point in dispute. Every Romish priest, when ordained, swears, in the terms of the creed of pope Pius IV., "never to receive or interpret Scripture except according to the unani-

mous consent of the fathers." Now, what are the *sentiments of some of the fathers as to the duty of all men reading the word of God?* Jerome* notices it of Lacta, a noble Roman lady, that she taught her daughter from early childhood to cultivate a love for the sacred Scriptures, instead of jewellery and silks; that she learned patience from the example of Job, and that she never suffered the gospel to be out of her reach. Augustine† says: "Do not allow yourselves to be so immersed in present earthly things, as to be obliged to say, I have no time to read or to hear God's word." Chrysostom thus speaks: "As many of the poorer classes are constantly making this excuse, that they have no Bibles, I would like to ask them, Can poverty, however great it may be, hinder a man, when he does not possess, to complete all the tools of his trade? What then! Is it not singular that in this case he never thinks of laying the blame to his poverty, but does his best that it may not hinder him; while, on the other hand, in a case where he is to be so great a gainer, he complains of his poverty?"‡ We have next to inquire, What is the *present law and practice of the Romish church with respect to the Holy Scriptures.* The ecclesiastical rule upon this subject which is now in force, will be found in the fourth canon of the Index concerning prohibited books, prepared by authority of the Council of Trent, and sanctioned by a bull

* Jerome's death occurred A. D. 420. Augustine survived him ten years.

† See Appendix F. ‡ See Appendix G.

of Pius IV. in 1564, and by many of his successors, down even to the present day. To this canon* we refer the reader. And what is the present practice of the church of Rome in this matter? Pope Leo XII., in 1824, denounced the Protestant Bible as "the gospel of the devil," and as "deadly pastures." An intelligent traveller, on making inquiry in 1848, in every bookseller's shop in Rome, did not find in any one of them a single portable copy of the Scriptures in the language of the people. One of the most respectable of the trade presented a copy of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, and insisted to the last that it was the Bible itself. In the cathedral at Milan, there may be seen several phials full of the teeth, bits of skin, scraps of hair, pieces of the nails, etc., of the twelve apostles, but

* "Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety they apprehend will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any shall have the presumption to read or possess it without any such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected by the bishop to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors."—*Can. et Dec. Conc. Tridentini.* Lipsiæ, 1846, p. 232.

not a single copy of the sacred Scriptures.* It is with difficulty that an English traveller can carry with him into the states of the church one copy of the Bible for his own private use.

The proceedings of councils and popes, in condescending to sanction bishops and others in issuing licenses to authorize the people to read the word of God, ought not to pass without an observation. Not to speak of the difficulty of obtaining these licenses, it is obvious that, to assume the power to permit the performance of that which the Most High has prescribed as the duty of all, is a daring flight of bold impiety. "Is it come to this, that the medicine of life is to be dealt out with a sparing and cautious hand; or mixed with foreign ingredients, like arsenic or hemlock, which are only safe when administered in a diluted form, and in small quantities?"

We have seen an example of the evidence which proves that the church of Rome has been always changing, while she ceases not loudly to proclaim her infallibility. *On what principle can it be explained that multitudes of men continue their adherence to such a church?* There is one thing which may seem to throw a little light upon this anomaly in the system of Popery. We refer to what has been termed the Act of Faith. It stands in the Douay Catechism thus: "O great God! I firmly believe all those sacred truths which thy holy Catholic church believes and teaches; because

* These facts are found stated in Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*. London, 1849, pp. 79 and 221.

thou, who art truth itself, hast revealed them. Amen."* The full import of this confession will more fully appear from the following dialogue. A Protestant asks a Romanist, What do you believe? *R.* I believe what the church believes. *P.* What does the church believe? *R.* The church believes what I believe. *P.* Well, then, what is it that both you and the church believe? *R.* We both believe the very same thing. "This easy and compendious confession of faith has resulted from the indolence, the spiritual carelessness, the weakness, and the dishonest ambition of human nature." "To believe everything and to know nothing," is the perfection to be attained by members of the church of Rome. Here, truly, ignorance is the mother of devotion. How rightly is this confession called *implicit* faith; for the propositions to be believed are wrapped up and hidden from the perceptions of him who says that he believes them; but what shameful effrontery to teach men to make this confession in the shape of a solemn address to the Deity, with an appeal to his infinite knowledge! The "Act of Faith" is the last degradation of an intelligent mind, the heavy and unnatural breathing of a responsible being, who has allowed himself to sink into the deepest spiritual slumber.

While *every individual* is under a sacred obligation to read and interpret the word of God for himself, *he is equally bound to avail himself of every aid within his reach, in order to attain a correct interpretation.* The opinions of the fathers of the

* Elliot's *Delineation of Roman Catholicism.* London, 1844, p. 15.

church, and all their successors, are to be examined by every one, so far as Providence affords opportunity—to be carefully studied and duly weighed. We have received the word of God itself through the hands of our fellow-Christians of preceding ages; but in accepting the Bible as the revealed will of God on their testimony, we have done no more than repose confidence on their evidence as to matters of fact. It is a widely different thing to bow to their authority in matters of doctrine. The judgment of our fellow-disciples, especially of the more learned and pious, on points of doctrine and duty, are neither to be lightly set aside, nor implicitly trusted. We are responsible to no human, no created authority, for the opinions which we shall adopt; but we are under an unavoidable and solemn responsibility to Almighty God. By professing the Act of Faith, a man would transfer the responsibility under which he lies to God, to the church; in other words, he raises the church—which practically means the church's priesthood—to the place of the Judge of all.

We have thus reviewed the arguments employed by Romanists in defence of their assumed church infallibility, and endeavoured to urge some considerations against that assumption, and in vindication of the authority of the word of God. The force of truth now seems to constrain us to adopt the conclusion, that it were as well to part with the Bible entirely and for ever,—to tear into shreds "the record of our salvation,"—to reduce to ashes "the charter of our immortality," as to yield one

iota of its supreme authority, of its sufficiency, or of its perspicuity;—an authority superior to every human tribunal; a sufficiency perfect for all present duty, and for the attainment of a full and eternal salvation; a perspicuity adequate on all matters of moment to all sincere inquirers. "Since the doctors," said Luther, "all labour to prove what they wrote by the Holy Scriptures, it follows that Scripture must be clearer and more conclusive than their writings. Who would ever think of proving what is in itself obscure, by the help of something obscurer still?"*

"Most wondrous book! bright candle of the Lord!
Star of eternity! the only star
By which the bark of man can navigate
The sea of life, and gain the port of bliss
Securely."

The dogma of infallibility is not an empty theory; it becomes, in the hands of the priesthood, an instrument of unmeasured influence in enslaving the people. Practically explained, it means, that *to those within the church there is no perdition, and to those without the church no salvation.* To the former, it is exhibited as a cheering rainbow of promise; to the latter, as a consuming thunderbolt of wrath. If the church be a theocracy, as Romanists maintain, a heavenly institution under the continual guidance and guardianship of God himself, it is an immediate and inevitable inference, that the church will claim to exercise, through the instrumentality of her officials, an absolute control over the present

* D'Aubigné's *History*, vol. ii. p. 189.

and future destinies of all men, saving all who trust in her, and consigning to woe all who doubt or disobey her. And this is precisely the practical aspect which the church of Rome assumes. To allow that he who enjoys the services of the priesthood might be lost, or to allow that he who does not enjoy them might be saved, would be equally fatal to the whole system.

The assertion that there is no salvation out of the pale of the church, has been made more prominent than the other—that within the church there is no damnation—which is equally essential to Popery, and equally pregnant with great consequences. In illustration of the latter, we refer to the testimony given by the Rev. J. Burnet before the House of Lords, in 1825: "The confidence of the people in their absolution which follows confession was such, as completely to destroy in their minds any fear of future punishment—that no Roman Catholic of the lower orders had any dread of final perdition; that he had spoken to them frequently on the subject, and never found one of them that supposed he could go to hell." Another striking example of the same thing is found in the Duke of Brunswick, who assigns as his last reason for embracing the Roman Catholic religion, the following: "The Catholics to whom I spoke concerning my conversion assured me, that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves,—an assurance I could never extort from

the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion." The dazzling glory of infallibility is thus reflected from the mind of every individual member of the church. In the heart of a consistent Romanist there is neither unconcern nor doubt upon the momentous question of his soul's salvation. He has peace ot conscience, because he has paid what he believes to be its price. This peace, be it false or true, is highly prized, because it has cost him much. He who makes the costly purchase by payments in the shape of confessions, offerings, and penances, feels that it is reasonable that he should be at ease. Deep as this delusion may be, such persons will rise up in the judgment to condemn those who, without obtaining peace of mind on any ground of confidence which appears to themselves to be well founded, go on from day to day—in the plainly unreasonable and awfully perilous temper of unconcern or indecision—continually adjourning that question which should be the first, and will be the last, in the consideration of every man,—the question of his eternity.

It is this aspect of Popery which, perhaps more than anything else, gives it so much power over the popular mind. "Man is more desirous of a quiet and approving, than of a vigilant and tender conscience; studies to escape the thought of spiritual danger, more than the danger itself; and to induce at any price some one to assure him confidently that he is safe; to prophesy unto him smooth things." It is the great business of the

Roman priest to minister to this slothful disposition; and he is aided in this work by a delusion very common among half-informed and indolent minds, that Popery is the *safe* side. This delusion rests upon two fallacious principles. The one is the confidence and readiness with which the priesthood profess to be able to calm every mental anxiety, and meet every spiritual necessity. The other is, that Popery seems to possess whatever belongs to Protestantism, and a great deal more. Of the former we have already spoken; the latter is a very plausible consideration, which has drawn over to the ranks of Popery a large majority of her recent converts, and retains within her pale thousands of doubting souls. It is obviously, however, altogether unreasonable, and can only be received by such as wish to be misled. If a reformed Christian may be saved, it is argued, a Roman Christian has a double ground of hope. This would represent Popery and Bible Christianity as a larger and smaller growth from the same root; whereas the one is the most poisonous of all plants, and the other is the tree of life.*

God has provided, and the Bible promises, an assurance equally strong with that possessed by

* In reference to this it has been said: "I know of few absurdities that can be compared to this. Suppose a poor helpless person is dying of a dreadful complaint. An eminent physician hears of his distress, calls on him, and prepares a medicine, which he desires the patient to take, under a strong injunction to trust in it alone for life. In the absence of the physician, our patient begins to think on the prescription, and, because it appears to him too simple, mixes it with every quack medicine that neighbours recommend. Having swallowed the whole, he now comforts him-

any Romanist, but of a better quality. A pure, vigorous Christianity so far agrees with this tenet of Popery, as to charge with the highest guilt unconcern in any man's mind respecting the personal question of his eternal destiny, and to remove all unavoidable occasions, or reasonable excuses, for continuing in harassing doubt. This close resemblance to the truth, this well-finished mask of living piety, gives to Popery both a specious semblance and much real strength; but the peace of mind obtained by believing the gospel is very different from that by which Popery deludes her victims. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," Rom. viii. 14—17. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore, thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ," Gal. iv. 6, 7. An uncontaminated and unmutilated Christianity, then, rejects equally the ungodly apathy of infidelity, and the painful hesitation of unbelief. By infidelity is meant the disposition which admits religious truth neither into the understanding nor self with the assurance that he is on the safe side. Why? Because he has mistrusted the physician, and divided his confidence between the only man whose skill can save him, and the old women of the village."—B. White's *Letter to Converts from Romanism.*

the heart; and by unbelief, a temper of mind, which, comprehending the gospel intellectually, will not in good earnest embrace it.

The assumption of infallibility has another practical aspect, already noticed, which brings the advocates of the church of Rome into direct collision with all other professing Christians. It were easy to prove that it is to this day a distinguishing tenet of Popery, that there is *no salvation out of her pale*. For example, the following sentiment is found in the text-book now in use in the college of Maynooth: It is most certain that schismatics and heretics do not belong to the church, and are out of the way of salvation.* Though this sentiment has never been denied, nor even materially qualified, by any ecclesiastical authority, from the pope downwards, numerous and skilful efforts have of late been made, especially in this country, to soften its offensiveness and turn its edge.

We can only at present notice one of these. Dr. Milner, author of "The End of Religious Controversy," has said, that salvation is denied to heretics and schismatics only in the case of "invincible ignorance." This exception—and the same remark will apply to many similar exceptions which may be met with in the literature of the day—is unauthorized by the standards of the church. The decree of pope Boniface VIII. and the Lateran Council runs in these words: "We declare, assert, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary to salvation for every human being to be

* See Appendix H.

subject to the pope of Rome."* There is no qualification here; and this is one proof out of a hundred that are at hand. Besides, the statement of this exception is too indefinite to be of any value. With perfect propriety it may be characterized in the language which has often been applied by Romanists to the word of God,—it is a shoe that will fit any foot.† "Invincible ignorance!" Invincible by what? By all the terrors and tortures of the Inquisition? If this be the meaning of the phrase, then let the adherents of Popery have all the advantage of the exception. If it mean invincible by instruction and argument (and who so rash as to defend any other explanation), we have then to ask, Why do the priests of Rome always prefer the coercion of power to the persuasion of argument, and place more confidence in the sword of persecution than in the eloquence of preaching?‡ Whichever meaning we attach to "invincible ignorance," of the only two which it can bear, in both cases has the church of Rome ever

* See Appendix I.

† Romanists, in speaking of the word of God, have employed many other comparisons of a similar kind, with which the author hesitates to disfigure his page; such as, "A nose of wax which suffers itself to be moulded this way, and that way, and however you like;" "A shop for heretics;" "A forest for thieves," etc.

‡ "I am sure you are not ignorant how many thousand heretics we have in France by the power of our dragoons converted in the space of one year, and by the doctrine of those booted apostles turned more in one month than Christ and his apostles could in ten years. This is a most excellent method, and far excels those of the great preachers and teachers that have lived since Christ's time."—PERE LA CHAISE, Confessor of Louis XIV., to Father P—rs, 1688. *Harleian Miscellany*, vol. vii. p. 163. London, 1746.

regarded it as the guiltiest heresy. To admit as valid the plea of sincere conviction or of insuperable stolidity, in cases of individual non-conformity, were to draw the life-blood of papal infallibility. How many cases are there on record of men whose ignorance has remained invincible, not only on the arena of learning and logic, when assailed by the ablest doctors of the infallible church, but also when tested in the sevenfold-heated furnace of her inquisitorial fires! and the homage rendered to the incontrovertible sincerity of these convictions, or the pity manifested to this unconquerable stupidity, by the authorities of Rome, has been to scatter the ashes of these men to the winds of heaven.

This doctrine of exclusive salvation, as exhibited in Popery, tramples at once upon love and truth: upon love, by damning all beyond her pale; and upon truth, by saving all within it. The interests of truth and those of love may sometimes appear to be in opposition, but they are indeed at all times inseparable. Truth is the girdle of love; love is the essence of truth. "Charity thinketh no evil;" but when she beholds evil, she dare not deny its existence—she dare not withhold her testimony against its turpitude. "He that believeth not is condemned already," is a statement which, though it be sharper than the keenest saying of the most fiery zealot, may not in the least degree be modified or softened. "He that is not with me is against me" (Matt. xii. 30), is the motto of truth. "He that is not against us is on our part," (Mark ix. 40), is the motto of love. Love and truth

stand as two sentinels at the gate of heaven, and ought to be found, likewise, at the door of every church: love prevents truth from excluding any but those who are really enemies to the King of glory; while truth prevents love from admitting any but those who are truly his friends. Liberalism would sacrifice truth upon the altar of love; bigotry would sacrifice love upon the altar of truth. Both have attained their highest developments under the patronage of the church of Rome, for she has canonized some of the worst, and anathematized some of the best of men.

Has the church of Rome in our day renounced the claim of infallibility? She has not. There is not a fragment of evidence to show that she has; there is much to prove the contrary. There was recently convened at Thurles, in Ireland, a Roman Catholic synod, which issued an address stating, among other things, that, "however good the intentions of the Legislature might be, the Queen's Colleges in Ireland were established *in ignorance of the inflexible nature of the Roman Catholic church.*" With what feelings, then, can we regard such appeals as the following, coming from unauthorized pens: the author whom we are about to quote, feels so strongly, that he expresses his sentiments in the form of an exclamation, and with the help of irony: "The Catholics are to be at once convicted, if they cannot justify the whole of their previous life, and the lives of all their ancestors for sixteen centuries past. Their present opponents, by a masterly induction, cite the

iniquities of Catholics three centuries ago, as proof incontrovertible of similar intentions now!" Such a mode of defensive argumentation, since it plainly relinquishes the dogma of infallibility, which in fact the church has not abandoned, is either the self-deception of a blinded mind, or the subtle wile of Jesuitism. "An infallibility extending to some points of religious belief, and not to others, is a ridiculous chimera." "An infallible religion changed is nearly a contradiction in terms." Let the people who adhere to the church be distinguished from the priests, who really constitute the church. And if there be meaning in language, or sacredness in oaths, the Roman priesthood of the present day, from his holiness in the Vatican down to his meanest tool who presides in the confessional, cannot be held acquitted, in a court of impartial justice, from the charge of approving of all that their predecessors have done. It would indeed be matter of undissembled and unmixed pleasure, if there were sufficient evidence to justify the belief, that the Romanists of the present time have in earnest sincerity abandoned the wicked and intolerant principles of their forefathers. But what is the practical aspect of the case? There is no lack of courtesy, but no inch of concession; there is no want of address, but no mark of repentance; there is vaunting urbanity and smooth civility, only to conceal more dexterously rigid infallibility. What step has been retraced? what error has been revoked? The flag of truce is indeed frequently displayed, but it is always carried

by non-commissioned men. To believe it to be aught else than a stratagem, were at once to prostitute the purity of love, and blindfold the eyes of truth.

It is now time for every right-hearted man to arise, grasping in his hand the "sword of the Spirit." Popery would burn the word of God; but it is scattered abroad with the ashes of every conflagration. Popery would conceal the word of God; but it is like the light of the sun, which cannot be covered. Popery would pervert the word of God; but it is like the dew of heaven, which cannot be poisoned. Popery witnessing the disappointment of her subtlest and strongest efforts, bursts into an impious fit of furious rage. The ebullitions of this rage may be seen in the language of the papal bulls, which have been issued against Bible societies, within the memory of the present generation.

Neglect of the Bible, which is the worst folly and the greatest crime, may be manifested, not simply by allowing it to remain unread, and covered with dust upon our shelf, or by leaving its golden clasps unfastened as it lies glittering upon a drawing-room table, but also by hearing as if we heard not, or by reading as if we read not. To prize the Bible less highly, to peruse it less frequently, to study it less earnestly, or to pray over it less devoutly, than is clearly demanded by the supreme majesty of its Author, by the infinite importance of its contents, by the boundless mercy of its invitations, by the shortness and uncertainty of life, by the illimitable duration of eternity, by

the depth of Immanuel's humiliation and the unreckoned value of the human soul, by the incurable vanity of earth, the irretrievable ruin of hell and the inconceivable blessedness of heaven, is unmanly, irreligious, fatal negligence.

How great and sincere should be our efforts to understand, defend, and disseminate the Holy Scriptures! *Health*, *fortune*, and *life*, have been spent by many a philosopher in the advancement of science, have been sacrificed by many a statesman in the service of ambition, have been squandered by many a soldier in the game of worldly glory, have been lavishly cast by many a lover at the feet of his mistress, have been dedicated by many a patriot on the altar of his country, and have been consecrated into idols, alas! by many a selfish mind. The knowledge of the word of God is the noblest and most profitable science; the hope of heaven inspired by the Bible is the purest and loftiest preferment; the loss of the world for the gospel of Christ is the brightest and most enduring glory; zeal for the Holy Scriptures is most rational when most intense; to spread abroad the word of truth is the soundest patriotism and the highest philanthropy. Let each individual, therefore, arise with his firmest resolution, constrained by the love of Christ, and relying on the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit, to consecrate all his energies, and devote all his means, to the study, the defence and the diffusion of the word of God.

CHAPTER V.

PRIESTLY POWER AND THE PAPAL SUPREMACY OPPOSED TO THE PRIESTHOOD AND DIVINE PREROGATIVES OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, 'Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee.' The penitent must also submit himself to the judgment of the priest, who is the vicegerent of God, to enable him to award a punishment proportioned to his guilt."—*Catechism of Council of Trent*. Part ii. cap. v. q. 10 and 22.

"The apostolical chair and the Roman pontiff hold a supremacy over the whole world; and the Roman pontiff is the successor of St. Peter the prince of the apostles, the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the church; and he is the father and teacher of all Chris-

DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

"Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."—*Hebrews* iv. 14—16.

"And being found in fashion as a man, He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee

tians; and to him in Peter full power is committed, by our Lord Jesus Christ, to feed, direct, and govern the universal church, according as it is contained in the acts of general councils, and in the holy canons."—*Council of Florence.*

"It is shown with sufficient evidence, that the pope (who, it is clear, *was called* God by the pious Prince Constantine) cannot be bound or loosed by the secular power; and it is manifest that God cannot be judged by man."—*Canon Law. Decret.* Prima Pars. Dist. xcvi. cap. vii.—See Appendix K.

should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." —*Philippians* ii. 8—11.

"All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth."—*Matthew* xxviii. 18.

"Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."—1 *Corinthians* iii. 21—23.

THE church of Rome does not openly contradict the above Scriptures, but she effectually supersedes them; she does not formally deny the priesthood and Divine prerogatives of the Lord Jesus Christ, but she practically dispenses with them.

The supremacy of the pope is intimately connected with the power assumed by every priest, both as that power is asserted in the standards of the church, and as it is exercised over the people, especially in the confessional. It appears from the first of the above quotations, that every priest is declared to be *the vicegerent of God*, possessed of full authority to forgive sins. The papal supremacy is the almost immediate fruit of this priestly power, especially as it is developed in a church that assumes to be unerring. When men bring themselves to believe that there is not only the

strongest obligation or a moral necessity to cultivate brotherly love, but something like a physical necessity for a visible church unity, there will appear a nearly equal necessity for an external representation of this unity. And where shall this representation be found but in the Pontifex Maximus, the high priest of the system? This conclusion is the more easily reached, because the supreme power arrogated by the pope is not different in kind, or higher in degree, than that claimed by every priest, but only larger in extent. The priest in the confessional exercises unlimited sway over the entire inner man of each of his victims, by seizing on the reins of the soul—its religious hopes and fears; and having thus gained the power to arrange their eternal affairs, finds no difficulty in managing their temporal concerns. Many an obscure priest thus succeeds in governing his parish with that absolute control with which the pope aims at ruling in the church and the world. Infallibility finds its practical locality in every priest, who may be correctly described as a "sovereign of souls." He who believes that sovereignty over the soul *does not* bring with it sovereignty over the body and the estate, may be left to his own simplicity. And since every inferior priest is subject to the high priest in the Vatican by a code of rules stricter than the strictest martial law, it follows, that, wherever Popery has room for development, the pope stands forth the supreme sovereign of the souls of men, and, as the necessary result of this, supreme sove-

reign of their persons, of their property, and of their domestic and civil privileges.

THE POWER OF THE PRIEST.

The chief and almost only direct argument adduced in suppport of the assumed power of the Romish priest, is founded on these words of Scripture, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," Matt. xviii. 18. We dwell not on the preliminary and weighty objection, that the position to be proved, namely, that a mere man, even though he were the holiest and the best, possesses and exercises a delegated but absolute authority to forgive sins, involves sheer impiety, which cannot be proved, and needs no refutation. The inference that Romanists would draw from the above text cannot be allowed, unless each of the following assertions be true: that the priests of the papacy, or their representatives, are in this passage addressed by our Lord; that the authority conferred upon the persons addressed is the plenary authority of God, who can alone pardon the guilty; and that the word rendered "whatsoever," refers to persons, and not to things. These three assertions seem to us to resemble so many impassable chasms, across any one of which the thread of human learning cannot stretch, nor the vigour of human genius bound. But across every one of them each popish priest fearlessly leaps in

his haste to the confessional, spurning the restraints of literature, and straining till he destroys the integrity of his own understanding. As to the question, who the persons were whom our Lord addressed, it seems most reasonable to suppose, that they were the twelve, and they alone; for they have had no successors in the apostolic office. The power which by these words they received from our Lord, was a commission to lay the foundations of the Christian church: the expressions, "to bind and to loose," being commonly used by the Jews as equivalent to these—to forbid, and to allow. The meaning of the text, then, seems to be this: whatever things (for the word in the original cannot indicate persons) the apostles, under the inspiration of God, ordained during their lifetime, or committed to writing for the use of posterity, are to be held obligatory upon earth, because they are held valid in heaven.

The authority assumed by every father confessor to forgive sins, is retained by the Almighty as his own incommunicable right. When our Lord said to the sick of the palsy, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee" (Matt. ix. 2), "the scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth." Our Lord seems to allow that this inference would be valid on the supposition that he was no more than a mere man; for he immediately proceeds to correct their misconception of his character. Assuming that their mode of reasoning is fair, he vindicates the propriety of the language he had used, by performing a miracle in

his own name: thus demonstrating his possession of Divine authority. The form of absolution used by every Romish priest is not, "May God absolve thee!" or, "May Christ absolve thee!" but, "I absolve thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Of every individual, therefore, who uses these words within the vail of the confessional, and fails to prove his right to use them by performing a miracle, not feigned but real, it may truly and sadly be said, "This man blasphemeth."

Every priestly confessor is an intruder between Christ and the sinner—an usurper of the seat of "our great High Priest, Jesus, the Son of God." Christ is called a "great" High Priest, not because he is first among many, but because he has superseded the typical priesthood of the house of Aaron, and is "supreme in dignity and every excellence, singular, sole, and unrivalled: having no equal, partner, or successor in office." (See Heb. vii. 24.) The priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ is perfect, because it is real, and not symbolical (Heb. viii. 6); because it is possessed of all moral excellence (Heb. vii. 26); and because it is fully suited to secure the end for which it was ordained,—the salvation of guilty men. (Heb. iv. 15; v. 9; vii. 25, 28; viii. 6; ix. 14, 28; x. 9—14.) The priesthood of heathenism is an ignorant and delusive substitute for the faultless priesthood of God's incarnate Son; while the priesthood of Rome occupies the ground of bold, continual, and uncompromising opposition. Our great High Priest, having offered the sacrifice

of himself, passed into the heavens (or rather through the heavens). With an expiation and propitiation, not symbolical, but of infinite value in the eyes of the Holy One, Christ passed through all the visible glories of creation, and took his seat at "the right hand of the Majesty on high." Seated on "the throne of grace," he invites our reverential yet bold approach, and promises to bestow, not mediately through the hands of others, but directly, to every suppliant the largest blessings. His unceasing intercession in the presence of Jehovah obviously implies "the continued presentation of his obedience and sacrifice, as ever valid and efficacious for pardon and acceptance, the perfected holiness and eternal blessedness, of all who are truly penitent, believing, and obedient."

In the "Garden of the Soul," an authoritative manual of the church of Rome, are found the following directions for confession:—"Kneeling down at the side of your ghostly father, make the sign of the cross, saying, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed virgin Mary, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to you, father, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault." After confession, the penitent is directed to say, "For these and all other my sins, which I cannot at this present call to my remembrance, I am heartily sorry, purpose amend-

ment for the future, and most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution of you, my ghostly father."*

Holy Scripture teaches the penitent a better way. We have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus" (Heb. x. 19); that is, we have *direct* access into the *immediate* presence of our God, without any medium but faith in Jesus' blood. "The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him, to all that call upon him in truth," Psa. cxlv. 18. "There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. ii. 5. Seated on his glorious throne, he has a present, a perfect, and an unending sympathy with all his believing people. Their cares, troubles, temptations, bereavements, and disappointments are not only known to him, but excite in his Divine bosom a fellow-feeling. He rejoices with them when they rejoice. And because he "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," it is neither unreasonable nor irreverent to assert, that his perfect humanity sheds tears of sympathy with his weeping people; for if there be no tears of joy and sympathy in heaven, there will be another and a better way of giving expression to those deep and holy feelings which on earth can find their only utterance in tears. The sympathy of the glorified Son of man with his people (if for a moment it might be personified), is clothed in the apparel of infinite love, crowned with the diadem of unerring wisdom, and girt with the panoply of almighty

* *The Garden of the Soul*, p. 190. Derby: Thomas Richardson.

power. There is no moment, by day or by night, that an audience is not granted by our exalted Redeemer, when humbly and boldly requested by a penitent sinner. The multitude of applicants, however great, never excludes any suitor, nor even delays the consideration of any case. There is no perplexity in our affairs that our Advocate with the Father cannot unravel; no misfortune that he cannot repair; no good that he cannot bestow; no evil that he cannot avert; and no sincere petitioner that he will reject. His boundless love is yearning, his omnipotent might is waiting, and his infinite wisdom is contriving, how to allay his people's fears, how to soothe their sorrows, and how to heal their wounds, as shall best consist with the promotion of their perfect holiness, and the consummation of their eternal salvation.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

"The priesthood of *Christ* is the central point of the true religion; the priesthood of *man* is the seminal lie of every false religion." The papal supremacy is the full-blown flower of this pernicious seed. That every pope has universal and uncontrolled dominion over the souls, and, by the easiest inference, over the bodies also, of all men, is one of the chief characteristics of Popery. This doctrine is found in all her catechisms framed for the instruction of youth, and in all her creeds intended for the guidance of maturer years; it stands

prominent in the decrees of general councils; it has been again and again proclaimed from the Vatican, and administered as actual law by reigning pontiffs; it has been received and submitted to by inferior synods, by powerful monarchs, and by national senates; it has been, and still is, defended and inculcated in her most celebrated schools and colleges; it has been, and still is, expounded and vindicated by her greatest theologians: all her clergy are bound by solemn professions to believe, acknowledge, and teach it; and it is generally professed by all her members; for whoever disclaims it, becomes thereby a heretic and an enemy to the Roman see. "Without the pope, the church of Rome is a maimed or headless body."

In the fifth Lateran Council, Christopher Marcellus thus addressed pope Julius II., of infamous memory: "Thou art the shepherd; thou art the physician; thou art the governor; thou art the husbandman; finally, *thou art another God upon earth.*"* Here, then, is a claim whose assertions are altogether unqualified, whose bounds are measureless, and whose results are interminable. Unless a claim of this description *professedly* rest, which it does not, upon the simplest and clearest evidence, even to entertain the formal consideration of it seems not unlike surrendering the first principles of reason. To debate the lawfulness of such a pretension, unless it be made to rest avowedly, and on its very first appearance, upon the most indubitable miracles, is positive degrada-

* See Appendix L.

tion to the human mind; for the assumption of it by any individual, and still more so by a succession of men, is a direct and undisguised infringement of the prerogatives of Deity.

The arguments generally adduced in defence of the doctrine of papal supremacy are founded upon the pleas of necessity and of Scriptural statement.

As to the argument from *necessity*, it is hard to see what urgent call there is for the authority of a supreme visible governor of the church; especially when we give to the word of God that high position which, we have seen, it claims, and of which it is worthy. It is still harder to perceive how any human being, even the best that has ever lived, is capable of filling such an office and discharging its functions. And it is hardest of all to believe that the succession of Roman pontiffs, many of whom have not only desecrated the altar and dishonoured the throne, but brought disgrace upon human nature itself, should be the chosen seat of this exalted privilege.

As to the argument from *Holy Scripture*, it chiefly rests upon this passage: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc., Matt. xvi. 18, 19. This portion of God's word cannot support the papal claims, except on the supposition that our Lord, by the expression, "this rock," meant Peter's person, which cannot be proved. Supposing it were, it would be necessary to prove

further (which also cannot be done) that Peter, in receiving the keys of the kingdom of heaven, received a supremacy equivalent to that claimed by the pope. Granting that this were settled according to the mind of the Romanists, they would then be called upon to show that Peter had successors in this supreme office, and to substantiate the claims of the bishops of Rome to be his successors. So far are they from being able to make good these statements, that they can scarcely produce satisfactory evidence to prove that the apostle Peter was ever resident in Rome. And it is most certain that he was never bishop there. There is, moreover, a very obvious remark to be made, which seems of itself sufficient on this part of the argument, that the supposition which would constitute each individual in a long succession of office-bearers to be one and the same foundation, appears to be self-contradictory or altogether unmeaning.

The arguments which may be urged against the pontifical claims are diversified and powerful.

These claims *are not supported by antiquity.* The apostle Peter of the New Testament was no pope—he had no superiority over his fellow-apostles; neither was he infallible; for he not only denied his Lord, but also justly exposed himself to the reproof of Paul, Gal. ii. 11—14. At so late a date as the fourth century, the church of Jerusalem, and not the church of Rome, was called "the mother of all churches." The Second General Council, recognised by the church of Rome as such, was convened at Constantinople (A.D. 381) by the order of

the reigning emperor, *and contrary to the will of the Roman bishop.* If the voice of primitive Christianity is to be listened to, its verdict is against the pretensions of Rome; for Antioch, the first Gentile church, was for a considerable period called "the see of Peter." It was not till the Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) under Innocent III., that the pope's supremacy was synodically defined.*

The pretensions of the Roman pontiff are *antagonistic to the royal honours of the Prince of peace.* The Lord Jesus is King as well as Priest. He is "a Priest upon his throne," Zech. vi. 13. The subjects of the pope transfer to him the veneration and obedience which they owe to Christ. We are constantly reading in the New Testament, that Christ is Governor of all things for the good of his people; but never do we read of his administering his government through a substitute. To attempt to act as Christ's vicar, is therefore attempting to displace Christ from his mediatorial throne. Besides referring to the passage quoted in the beginning of the chapter (Phil. ii. 8—13), we solicit the reader's attention to the statements contained in Ephes. i. 20—23. In this scripture, we are clearly taught that Christ is constituted Head over all things for the benefit of the church. "God raised

* The thunderbolt thus formally and impiously seized did not slumber in the hand of Innocent. At the foot of his legate did John of England surrender his crown; by his orders tens of thousands of the Albigenses were slaughtered year by year; and to him is the world indebted for the establishment of transubstantiation and the origin of the Inquisition,—"the two most signal triumphs over sense and humanity."

him from the dead," threw a resurrection glory round his sacred head, so lately pained and dishonoured by thorny wounds, "and set him at his own right hand,"—where effulgent glory would consume the highest creature that should venture too near the precincts of the heavenly Majesty; "in the heavenly places,"—or in heaven itself—on the state throne of Deity,—"far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." While the dignity of the Messiah in the glory of his mediatorial kingdom is pre-eminently illustrious, his authority is uncontrolled, and his dominion universal. The Divine inauguration of Jesus as King is completed by the statement, "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." When the pope shall produce a commission as plain, as full, and as authentic as this, then, but not till then, may he expect the homage of intelligent men.

The prerogatives of Christ secure the privileges of his people. All things are theirs, because they are Christ's. (See 1 Cor. iii. 21—23.) Christ makes all things work together for good to his faithful followers, Rom. viii. 28. We are not aware that the pope has made a promise similar to this invaluable declaration; if he has, it is another added to the long list of his impieties. Again, the continual presence of Immanuel, even with the smallest company of his people on earth,

is most expressly promised in Matt. xviii. 20:—"Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Therefore the admission of an earthly vicar is not only superfluous, but intrusive, and must be regarded as a most ungrateful affront and offence to our Divine Redeemer.

How can he be esteemed as the vicar of Christ who, by obscuring and concealing, by perverting and persecuting, "the glorious gospel," has proved himself to be anti-Christ? How can he be reckoned and venerated as Peter's successor, who has more than the boldness, but none of the penitence, of Peter? How can the pope be called with propriety even a bishop, when he never puts his hands to the smallest part of a bishop's work? for he never teaches the people from the word of God, nor administers the ordinances of religion. Can he be accounted the head of the church who has led so many away from the church's true and adorable Head, and by his craft and cruelty so sorely rent the body of Christ? Can that be the apostolical see which has been a sink of all abominable immorality, and a den of extravagant impiety?

Past events demonstrate the fallacy of the pope's assumption. We cannot look into the history of Popery without finding in almost every page some striking fact to prove either the intensity of the pope's power to work evil, or the invalidity of his claim to occupy the place of God. His successes manifest the vigour of his tyranny; his reverses, the falsehood of his pretensions. The man who

boasts that he is Christ's vicar upon earth, must at every step be either dreaded or despised. The assumed prerogative of the Roman pontiff has been frequently and rudely invaded, and not seldom with impunity. From the days of Alaric, in the fifth century, to the times of Napoleon, Rome has been often besieged, pillaged, and laid waste; while the wearer of the triple crown has, by turns, been dishonoured, imprisoned, and slain. The holy city, as it has been called, was invested by the troops of Charles v., a Catholic king, and emperor of the Romans; and at the moment the city was taken, pope Clement VII. was offering prayers at the high altar of St. Peter's. Far from being able to save his capital, he did not succeed in his efforts to protect his own person; for he was made a prisoner of war, and was retained in captivity till a costly ransom was paid for his liberation. Bonaparte carried Pius VII. to Fontainebleau, where a concordat was arranged between them on the understanding that the pope should not again return to Rome: he was, however, restored to the Vatican mainly through the instrumentality of the non-Roman states, Germany, Russia, and England. The reigning pope, Pius IX., was a prisoner for some time in the Quirinal, whence he fled in the guise of a menial, and found refuge in Gaëta. He was brought from thence, and replaced in his see and in his chair, not by the *prestige* of his name, nor by the power of his arm, nor by the interposition of Heaven, but by the bayonets of France.

When we consider the contrast between the characters and claims of many of the Roman pontiffs, who to the most ungodly, profligate, and ferocious dispositions, have united the assumption of universal supremacy, temporal and spiritual,* there is not presented to the mind a more repulsive and revolting picture by the wildest excesses and atrocities of infidelity, or the most abject prostration and gross debaucheries of heathenism.

But of all other kinds of facts, those connected with *the schisms of the papacy* are most conclusive in demonstrating the fallacy of the papal pretensions. In the latter half of the fourteenth century, Urban VI., whose seat was at Rome, issued a bull of deposition against Clement VII. and all his adherents. The tenor of such an instrument ought to be known. Those against whom it is aimed are thereby spoiled of all their honours, dignities, offices, and benefits; their goods are confiscated, and their persons declared to be infamous and detestable; all faithful people, of what quality soever, not excluding kings, queens, and emperors, are forbidden to receive them into their houses, or afford them refuge on their property—to give or to send them bread, or wine, or meat, or wood, or money, or merchandise. On the other hand, Clement, whose seat was at Avignon, was not slow in hurling defiance and damnation against Urban and his party. It is obvious to all that, in this pontifical strife, the mantle of clerical

* See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xlix.

infallibility was rent, and the sceptre of papal supremacy broken.

But one or two pregnant facts are yet to be told. The church of Rome has not failed to own, and to canonize as saints, individuals who lived in the services, and died in the quarrels, of these two anti-popes. For she has canonized Catherine of Sienna, who espoused the side of Urban, and treated his opponent at Avignon as anti-Christ and a member of the devil, and his cardinals as devils incarnate; while she has also canonized Peter of Luxembourg, who, at the time of his decease, was cardinal of Clement, and had received that dignity from his master's hands, against the express prohibition of Urban, under pain of excommunication. Infidelity sneers at the ecclesiastical contest; Christianity weeps at the prostitution of her name in such a conflict; reason insists that if the church will consider the one to be a saint, she ought to regard the other as a heretic; and infatuation says to implicit faith, *Both* of them are saints.

It now remains to inquire, What is the *present aspect* of the papal supremacy? Are the pretensions of the pope now different from what they have been in the times that are past? Whoever affirms that a change has taken place, neither pope nor cardinal, bishop nor priest, has directly made, or formally assented to the affirmation. The power of the bishops of Rome has waxed and waned in the political firmament, and their policy has been as diversified as the shifting scenes in the drama of

European history; but their purposes and principles are all stereotyped in the ambition of the human heart, and in the very constitution of the Roman hierarchy. Till the present pope shall rescind the canon law, it is impossible not to believe that his pretensions are as high as mortal pride can rise, although they are often only as prominent as prudence will permit. And they are prominent enough to awaken all the watchfulness, and stimulate all the prayerfulness, of the friends of liberty and the servants of God.

The recent appointment of a cardinal to reside in England, and the other proceedings connected therewith, have been avowedly justified on the plea, that they are necessary to the introduction of the canon law into this country. We insert from the pen of a learned writer a summary of the contents of this universal code of the popedom, so far as they refer to the matter in hand: "The canon law decrees and enjoins that all heretics (and every person knows that Protestants are deemed to be eminently such) are to be punished, when it *can be done*, by every kind of suffering that the art of man can devise: non-intercourse in trade or in any way; disinheriting, expatriation, loss of property, imprisonment, tortures, death in any form, but chiefly by being burned alive, and barbarous indignities to the dead corpse; that kings or queens, princes, and all persons, even parents, brothers, and children, are held guilty, and liable ultimately to the same punishment, if they

do not their utmost for the execution of those penalties, or if they screen or support in any way the denounced heretics; that upon the excommunication and other sentence of the ecclesiastical authority being declared, the offenders are to be delivered over to the secular judge; that if the temporal authority refuse or neglect to inflict his part of the punishments, *he shall himself be excommunicated*, with the terrible consequences; and that informers, though accomplices, or convicted of perjury, shall be held valid witnesses.—See, then, my countrymen, the benedictions provided for you by the pope and his cardinal."*

It has been shown by Lessius, a Romanist author of some celebrity, that the power of deposing kings was claimed by Gregory VII., Urban II., and Gregory IX., and by the following general councils: those of Lateran, under Alexander III., and Innocent III.; the Councils of Lyons, of Vienna, of Constance, of Lateran, under Leo X., and of Trent. We have also recent examples of the same kind: the pope, in 1801, absolved the French people from their oath of allegiance to Louis, their king, and gave them authority to swear fidelity to Napoleon, as First Consul; and

* *Reasons of Protestantism*, pp. 44, 45. By Rev. J. P. Smith, D.D. London, 1851. "These particulars," says Dr. Smith, "I select out of many, in the tedious and disorderly order of the Body of the Canon Law, (*Corpus Juris Canonici, Gregorii XIII. P. M. Jussu editum*,) 2 vols. folio, Frankfort, 1748, particularly in vol. 2, the decretals of Gregory IX, Book 5, and those which form the 6th book, published in 1698."

again, in 1809, he proceeded to excommunicate and anathematize Bonaparte.

The facts now mentioned are in perfect harmony with the more personal pretensions of the present bishop of Rome. It is mentioned by Dr. Townsend, in the journal which he has published of his tour in Italy in the year 1850, that as he was leaving the presence of the pope, with whom he had succeeded in obtaining an interview, a lady and gentleman from Cuba entered, and *both knelt down as to God* at the folding-doors of the audience chamber, and repeated the same homage in the middle of the room.* The reigning pontiff succeeded Gregory XVI. in June, 1846, and was of course inaugurated by the same formalities as his predecessors. Among other ceremonies, he was elevated and placed upon the high altar of St. Peter's, where the bread and wine, as Romanists believe, are commonly transubstantiated into the person of Christ, that the Lord Jesus may be offered in sacrifice for sin. The words of coronation are so plain, that the dullest understanding cannot miss their meaning: "Receive the tiara adorned with the triple crown, and know that thou art the father of princes and of kings, the ruler of the world upon earth, as the vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be everlasting honour and glory. Amen."† To show the interpretation put upon such acts and words by the people, it may be mentioned that one of the

* Townsend's *Journal of a Tour in Italy*, p. 170. London, 1850.

† See Appendix M.

leading popish journals of the day, in reporting the proceedings, stated that the people hailed the newly-consecrated pope with the first, the second, and the third adoration.

Some orators of the present day indulge in slighting or contemptuous expressions, as if the recent excitement regarding Popery were unreasonable; like

> "Ocean into tempest tossed,
> To waft a feather or to drown a fly."

They speak of "the vain assumption of foreign imbecility, the tinsel dignity of bishops, the scarlet vanity of cardinals, the fulminated folly of the Vatican." We have no fears whatever for the interests of the church of Christ, and but few for the privileges of our own beloved land; but there are many reasons to be alarmed for the salvation of individual souls, and for the civil liberties of weak and infant states. If the popedom be correctly described as "foreign imbecility," how can the fact be explained, that its cruel behests against an independent queen and an innocent woman, whose island kingdom was one of the first and fairest fruits of Protestant missions, were obeyed by the gallant admirals of chivalrous France? How can it be explained that the heavy bills* of "foreign imbecility" are duly honoured by the Chancellor of the British Exchequer? If there be nothing more in Roman episcopal rank and power than "tinsel dignity," how should it be taking

* We refer, of course, to the various sums granted to the church of Rome, especially in Ireland and the colonies.

precedence in Ireland and in the colonies, if not yet elsewhere, of some of the best blood of Britain's nobility,—of some of her hereditary, or hard-won titles of patriotism? If there be nothing in a cardinal's insignia but "scarlet vanity," how marvellous that it should have raised, in the greatest, the richest, and the freest nation of the world, such an unusual excitement! If a papal excommunication be only a harmless and ludicrous ebullition of passion, it is a no less perplexing than painful fact, that so many millions of living men should be in greater practical and habitual terror of the Vatican's "fulminated folly," than of the thunders of the Divine law, and the dread solemnities of the "eternal judgment."

Nothing is more common at present than to hear Romanists insisting upon the distinction between temporal and spiritual power, and protesting that the pope's authority is entirely and exclusively religious and ecclesiastical, and that unqualified submission to papal supremacy is compatible with obedience and loyalty to a Protestant monarch. Volumes might be filled with extracts showing the frequency with which this sort of argument and defence is used. It is indeed the sheet-anchor of the cause. If such representations are to be credited, enough has been already said to prove that the Popery of the nineteenth century has a widely different complexion and character from the Popery of the ten centuries preceding. Let pope or cardinal or bishop openly avow that such a fundamental alteration in their religious system

has been introduced and allowed; let them anathematize their predecessors as they yet anathematize Protestants; or, better far, let every past anathema be repented of, and every present anathema revoked, and then they will be entitled to credit when they affirm, that in their system spiritual power does not involve and carry with it temporal power. Every kind of language that speaks of the pope's pretensions as not including universal temporal dominion, or that represents allegiance to Rome as consistent with fidelity to a Protestant throne, must be ever regarded and treated, if there be aught sacred in religion or precious in liberty, as the fatuity of profound ignorance, or the finesse of deep diplomacy.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, OPPOSED TO THE ATONEMENT MADE FOR SIN BY THE DEATH OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.	DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.
"Whosoever shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and Divinity, and consequently Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign and figure, or by his power, let him be accursed."—*Sess.* xiii. *Can.* 1.	"Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."—*Isaiah* liii. 4, 5.
"If any one shall say that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the Mass, or that what is offered is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat, let him be accursed."—*Sess.* xxii. *Can.* 1.	"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."—*Gal.* iii. 13.
"If any one shall say that by these words, 'Do this for a commemoration of me,' Christ did not appoint his apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should	"Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did *once*, when he offered up himself."—*Heb.* vii. 27. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others;

offer his body and blood, let him be accursed."—*Sess.* xxii. *Can.* 2.

"Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God, and therefore that the eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration; and that those that worship the same are idolaters, let him be accursed."—*Sess.* xiii. *Can.* 6.—*Canons of the Council of Trent.**

for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."—*Heb.* ix. 25, 26.

"By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."—*Heb.* x. 14.

"He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."—1 *John* ii. 2.

Hezekiah "brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it Nehushtan" (that is, a piece of brass).—2 *Kings* xviii. 4.

THE above passages of Scripture are not formally doubted, nor directly negatived by the church of Rome; but they are practically overlooked, and virtually neutralized by her erroneous doctrines.

The doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is a most extravagant conception, based upon the absurdity of transubstantiation, and crowned by the impiety of worshipping the host. This triple heresy is one of the most matured and extraordinary developments of error. If it be once admitted in the church that ceremonies in themselves possess some secret, potent virtue, they will soon rise to a most commanding position in the minds of the people; and if the church will have a priesthood,

* See Appendix N.

she must find priestly work to fill their hands. The mystic energy believed to be inherent in ritual observances will become more and more wonderful, more and more efficacious; while the work assigned to the priesthood will gradually grow more complicated and more indispensable. The church which has advanced so far, and boasts at the same time an unrent unity and a Heaven-directed course of action, believing that she is performing God's work on earth, saving whom He wishes to save, and condemning those who are doomed to perish, is prepared for any extravagance and impiety. She procures a bloodless victim at the hazardous cost of sense and reason, presents it to her ministers to be offered on an altar which she has profanely erected, and compels all to approve her proceedings by the performance of an act indicative of the lowest stage of mental degradation.

Of the three dogmas now to be more particularly considered, the first, that the bread and wine used in the eucharist become really, truly, and substantially Christ entire—his humanity and his Divinity—seems almost too preposterous for reason to condescend to its refutation; the second, that the glorious and exalted person of our Lord Jesus Christ is, on every occasion and in every place that the service of the mass is performed by a popish priest, offered anew as a propitiation for guilty men, is an opinion so directly and obviously antagonistic to one of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and so redolent of impiety, that the best feelings of the heart cannot but abhor it;

while the third, that every consecrated wafer from a Romanist altar is the incarnate Son of God, and to be worshipped accordingly, would appear intensely ridiculous, if it were not grossly idolatrous. It seems to be a wise arrangement of Providence that has allowed the errors of the church of Rome to proceed to such monstrous extremes, for in the bare announcement of many of them lies their most effectual antidote. If the mind of the student still obey the rudder of reason, and if conscience be yet true to the pole-star of truth, the very intellectual perception of the meaning of the language in which many of the dogmas of Rome are expressed, will produce an instant and irrepressible mental revulsion; as the sudden sight of breakers on the lee bow of his vessel, startles into painful consciousness the drowsy pilot, who thereupon instinctively changing his course, brings round his gallant bark, to bear away from the imminent peril.

Since errors, which in the bud appear to be harmless and even plausible, do nevertheless, when matured and full blown, assume the most distorted shapes, and emit the most pestilential influences, how careful and conscientious should every man be in forming his settled opinions; how firm and undaunted in defending every truth; and how forbearing and charitable in his dealings with opponents.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

In defence of this dogma the words of Scripture (Matt. xxvi. 26—28, and 1 Cor. xi. 23—26) are

appealed to. When our Lord held the bread in his hand, he said, "This is my body;" and this expression, it is maintained by Romanists, is to be taken literally. Let it be taken literally, and it will not support their opinion, which is, that by the pronouncing of these words, the bread is changed into our Lord's person. The phrase, "This is my body," literally interpreted, means that the body of our Saviour and the bread in his hand were identical, which is an obvious contradiction. Let us apply the same principle of interpretation to the other expression, "This cup is the new testament in my blood," and see whither it will lead us. When expounded literally, the cup will mean, not the wine in the vessel, but the vessel itself: this vessel and the new testament will be identical, and Christ's blood will be in his own hand while he is speaking. The words of the institution of the eucharist are spoken in a figure which is common to all languages, and intelligible to all men. "This is," has been in immemorial use in all nations as equivalent to "this signifies." "The seven good kine are (signify) seven years," Gen. xli. 26. The sign receives the name of the thing signified; as when our Lord, on other occasions, said, "I am the Door." "I am the Vine." If it had been real blood that was in the cup after our Lord pronounced the words of thanksgiving, it would have been contrary to the Jewish law for the apostles to have partaken of its contents.

Another scripture quoted by Romanists is found

in John vi. 53: "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Our Lord reproved the Jews for understanding these words in a gross and carnal manner; and the defenders of transubstantiation expose themselves to a similar rebuke. "When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" ver. 61, 62. As if he had said, The Son of man is about to leave the world; think not therefore that the better life of mankind depends upon turning his body into food. "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," ver. 63. That which is eaten passes through a process of disorganization and dissolution, but the flesh of the Lord Jesus can see no corruption. (See Psa. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 22—32.) So plain is this part of the argument, that many celebrated Romanists have conceded to their opponents, that transubstantiation is unsupported by Scripture. They then, of course, rest it upon the authority of the church. If the dogma were a nice and doubtful point, and the church's authority broad and settled, this arrangement might answer well, and the latter prove strong enough to uphold the former. But if ecclesiastical authority be a crazy edifice, and if this dogma be a concentration of absurdity and impiety, the latter is likely to prove a shell which, when ignited by a spark

from the fire of truth, or from the altar of godliness, will blow the tottering fabric into ruins.

Holy Scripture condemns the dogma of transubstantiation: "For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always," Matt. xxvi. 11. Moreover, the sacred body of the Lord Jesus was offered up only *once*, whereas the monstrous supposition, "that Christ entire is contained in the venerable sacrament of the eucharist, under each species (that is, both bread and wine), and under every part of each species when they are separated,"* implies that Christ is offered times *innumerable*. Besides referring to the Scriptures quoted in the beginning of the chapter, let the reader consult Heb. ix. 28, x. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 18.

This article of the Roman creed *is refuted by the testimony of the senses.* To believe in transubstantiation is to believe that a human body may be contained in the space of less than one inch; that the substance of bread is not present with the properties or qualities of bread; and that the substances of flesh and blood are present without their properties or qualities. Here we are met by the statement that it is a miracle. A miracle is a *deviation* from the laws of nature, effected to attest a Divine message, and can only be proved by the testimony of the senses. If transubstantiation were admitted to be a deviation from the laws of nature, it could not be shown to be brought about to accredit a communication from on high; for Romanists never profess even that such is its ob-

* *Canon of the Council of Trent*, Sess. xiii. can. 3.

ject. But it is not a deviation from the laws of nature; it is a *reversion* of certain laws with the continuance and integrity of which man's welfare is intimately blended. To believe that what seems to be bread and wine to the sight, taste, smell, and touch, is not bread and wine, is to reject the evidence of the senses, and in so doing, to launch at once on the dark, dread ocean of universal doubt.*

The dogma before us *is contradicted by reason.* The consecrated wafers are very numerous, when all that are found in different places are reckoned: hence it follows, that a body is separated into parts without separation; that the same body is in two places at the same time; that it is one, and yet not one, but many; that the same thing is larger than itself,—for wafers differ, or may differ, in dimensions; that the same thing moves, and does not move. Such absurdities might be multiplied almost without end: the argument demands a few, but the sacredness of the subject forbids the undue prosecution of the thought. Here again we are met by an attempted explanation. Romanists

* "It might well seem strange if any man should write a book to prove that an egg is not an elephant, and that a musket-ball is not a pike: it is every whit as hard a case to be put to maintain by a long discourse that what we see and handle and taste to be bread, is bread, and not the body of a man; and what we see and taste to be wine, is wine, and not blood; and if this evidence may not pass for sufficient, without any further proof, I do not see why any man, that hath confidence enough to do so, may not deny anything to be what all the world sees it is, or affirm anything to be what all the world sees it is not; and this without all possibility of being further refuted."—TILLOTSON.

say it is a mystery. A mystery is a truth which man could not of himself have discovered, or which he cannot fully comprehend, and which he believes on the testimony of God. Such is the doctrine of the Trinity; it has been revealed by God in language intelligible to all; it rests upon plain and sufficient evidence, though its full comprehension be beyond the grasp of the human mind. The dogma of transubstantiation, on the other hand, has not, as we have seen, been revealed by God; it has, therefore, no competent evidence on which to rest; and its bare announcement, if not unintelligible, conveys an idea which, instead of being described as mysterious, or above our intellectual capacity, must be pronounced absurd, or contrary to the primary dictates of our understanding.

Transubstantiation is *a novelty*. Some of the fathers of the Christian church may have entertained erroneous notions which proved the germ of this dogma, but the extravagant idea in its matured form never entered their imaginations. The word was first used by Stephen, bishop of Augustodunum, about the year 1100; it was inserted by pope Innocent III. in the decrees of the Lateran Council, which, though not enacted by that assembly, obtained authority by finding a place among the forged decretals of Gregory IX., and were first published under the name of the Lateran Council in 1538, by John Cochlœus. The dogma was authoritatively established by the Council of Trent in 1551.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

The vestments in which the officiating priest is clothed when the sacrifice of the mass is performed, are designed to be emblematical of various circumstances connected with the last scenes of our Saviour's life, and their colour is white, black, red, purple, or green, to suit different festivals. The altar is so arranged as to represent the cross. Upon the altar is the chalice or cup, into which has been poured wine mingled with water, and covering the cup is the plate with the wafer. The priest retires back from the altar three steps, and bows, to represent the prostration of Christ in the garden. The bread is unleavened, and every wafer bears the image of Christ, or the letters I.H.S.* Candles are burning. The priest, taking the elements into his hands, says: "Accept, O holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this unspotted host which I, thy unworthy servant, offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences, and negligences, and for all here present, as also for all faithful Christians both living and dead, that it may avail both me and them unto life everlasting. Amen."†

Let the reader weigh the import of this language, which is used at the celebration of every mass. The atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ may not be directly and professedly opposed and contradicted, but who can deny that it is virtually and

* They are the three first Greek letters of the name of Jesus.

† See Appendix O.

effectually superseded and set aside? It is written in Hebrews x. 18, "Now where remission of these (sins and iniquities) is, there is no more offering for sin." If this be admitted as the truth of God, the Romanists must choose between the two sides of the following alternative. They must either deny that by the death of Christ iniquities are remitted, or allow that the mass is not an offering for sin; as is expressly asserted in the preceding extract. They must either abandon the guidance of Holy Scripture, or renounce the authority of the church.

The Levitical sacrifices are referred to as precedents sanctioning the sacrifice of the mass, and this is indeed the chief argument urged in its defence. But it is to be observed, that the oblations of the Old Testament were enjoined by God, while that of the mass is not. In the one, there were real, though inferior victims provided; in the other, there is no living victim. The sacrifices of the Mosaic law were typical of Christ's atonement, and were abolished at his death. (See Heb. ix. 6—14.) In the sacrifice of the mass, we do not find the fulfilment of these ancient types, but a mockery of their true fulfilment—the crucifixion of our Lord. The mass is declared by the Council of Trent to be a "propitiatory offering;" but this is the chief characteristic of the Lord's decease accomplished at Jerusalem. Was the victim under the law pure and perfect? The Lamb of God, our sacrificial victim, was "without blemish and without spot." Was there an actual transference of transgression

from the offerer to the victim? So "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Did the victim in the temple of old bleed and die? So did the incarnate Son of God bow his head and give up the ghost. Was the offerer under the law absolved from the law's penalty? Through Christ is preached the forgiveness of sins, and "by him all that believe are justified from all things."

On the Lord Jesus Christ, during the short period of his earthly existence, were gathered together, in one insupportable load, the transgressions, not of one individual only, but of the vast company of the ransomed throng, in all their innumerable multitude, in all the sinfulness of their accumulated guilt, and in all the fearfulness of their merited reward. The cup which was put into his hands was deep and full; for in it were mingled the iniquities of an apostate race; and their bitterness was left unsweetened, and their deadly poison unmedicated. "He was delivered for our offences." That cup was emptied to the bottom by our Surety. "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." While the church of Rome admits all this, to boast that the sacrifice of Christ has been repeated times without number, and may be repeated every day by a wicked man, provided he be duly ordained a priest, is surely nothing less than to "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

In the Catechism of the Council of Trent, mass is called an "unbloody sacrifice."* The apostle

* "Incruente immolatur."—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxii. cap. ii.

Paul declares, "Without shedding of blood is no remission," Hebrews ix. 22. The Council of Trent declares that in the mass Christ is immolated; and yet that this immolation takes place without the effusion of blood. Immolation or sacrifice universally implies the shedding of blood. The church of Rome always uses the word in this acceptation; hence we infer that she expects men to be credulous when she becomes contradictory.

The inestimable benefits of Christ's death are offered gratuitously to all mankind, Isa. li. 1; Matt. xi. 28; Rev. xxii. 17. But the supposed advantages to be derived from the sacrifice of the mass cannot be obtained without money. It is by the saying of masses that souls are delivered from purgatory; and, for every mass that is said by the priests on behalf of suffering spirits, a fee is demanded and exacted. A recent traveller in Italy informs us, that the parish churches are much neglected and in an indifferent state of repair, and the parochial clergy, whose duty is the cure of souls, are too often found in poverty and destitution; while the establishments of the conventual and cathedral clergy, whose main duty is to say masses for the delivery of souls from purgatory, are exceedingly wealthy, being enriched by large donations and bequests, extorted as the price for sacrificing the Lord Jesus Christ in the mass.* Of late years, "Purgatorian Societies" have been established in Dublin, London, and elsewhere, whose members subscribe regular pecuniary instalments,

* Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 92.

by means of which funds are raised to defray the expenses of "procuring masses to be offered up for the repose of the souls of deceased parents, relations, and friends, of all the subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general." It is not unusual to observe in the Roman Catholic Directories such notices as these: Monthly masses will be said for such benefactors as will aid in paying off the debt on such and such chapels and schools; and masses will be said every quarter for those who are interred in such and such a burial-ground. It is the common practice of Romanists to purchase, as they believe, the release of the souls of their beloved friends who are suffering in purgatory, at an earlier period than they would otherwise escape thence, by procuring on their behalf the frequent performance of mass for pecuniary considerations; forgetting that "none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him. For the redemption of their soul is precious,"* Psalm xlix. 7, 8.

* "It is taught and believed in Italy, that a number of 'daily masses,' of 'high masses,' of 'remembrance masses,' of 'voluntary offerings,' can release suffering souls, or diminish the intensity of their sufferings in the frightful abode of purgatory, and thus tend to translate them to a state of rest in the regions of the blessed. The monks and friars of the inferior and mendicant orders avail themselves of this belief, and profess a readiness to offer, in the church of the convent, the requisite number of masses, provided a commensurate donation or gratuity be given to the convent, for the maintenance of the poor brethren. I have myself witnessed the bargain and arrangement for this; and have seen the masses purchased, the money paid and received, at the moderate charge of about 2*s*., to secure the release of a soul."—Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 161.

The practice of saying mass having proved the most successful means of replenishing the church's exchequer, opposition to it has ever been felt by the priesthood to be a peculiarly aggravated offence. It was chiefly for impugning and denying the doctrine of the mass, that the Protestants of this country were persecuted in the time of queen Mary. By her orders, fines, confiscations, and imprisonments were multiplied against those who refused to be present at the celebration of mass, or who called in question its propriety or necessity. It is recorded in history, that, during her reign, two-hundred and seventy-seven persons, including fifty-five women and four children, who lifted up their voices against this pestilent error, were, for this offence, consigned to the flames alive, and consumed amid circumstances of atrocity equal to, if not exceeding, the fiercest persecutions of heathen governments.

"This has been in the church of Rome the great burning article; and, as absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murdered for the denial of it, than perhaps for all the other articles of their religion. This doctrine has been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody tragedies that ever were acted in the world. O blessed Saviour! thou best friend and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagine that thou didst ever intend that men should kill one another for not being able to believe contrary to their senses; for being unwilling to think that thou shouldest make one of the most hard and barbarous things

that can be imagined, a main duty and principal mystery of thy religion; for not flattering the pride and presumption of the priest, who says he can make God; and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the people, who are made to believe that they can eat him?"*

The custom of keeping the cup from the laity in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which was introduced by the Council of Constance (A. D. 1415), is the natural consequence of belief in the opinions which we have been considering. If Christ entire be present both in the bread and in the wine, and, when separated, in every morsel of every wafer, and in every drop of every cup, it is unnecessary, and might be inconvenient, for the communicants to break the bread, and to pass the cup from hand to hand. But if any practice be directly opposed to Scripture injunction, it is that of communion in one kind; for it is written, "Drink ye all of it." If we have not here an instance of "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," where shall one be found?

WORSHIP OF THE HOST.

Pope Honorius (A. D. 1216) was the first to enjoin the priests to elevate the host, and to cause the people to prostrate themselves before it. The missal contains the following directions: "Having uttered the words of consecration, the priest, immediately falling on his knees, adores the consecrated host:

* Tillotson's *Works*, vol. i. p. 242. London, 1728.

he rises, shows it to the people, places it on the corporale, and again adores it."* The same form is observed after the consecration of the wine. The following is a description of a part of the more public ceremony, as it is observed in Spain, from the pen of an eye-witness: "The first appearance of the host in the streets is exceedingly imposing. Enriched by jewels of the greatest brilliancy, surrounded by lighted tapers, and enthroned on the massive yet elegant temple of silver, no sooner has it moved to the door of the church, than the bells announce its presence with a deafening sound, the bands of military music mix their animating notes with the solemn hymns of the singers, clouds of incense rise before the moving shrine, and the ear is thrilled by the loud voice of command, and the clash of the arms which the kneeling soldiers strike down to the ground. When the concealed bearers of the shrine present it at the top of the long street, where the route commences, the multitudes, which crowd both the pavement and the windows, fall prostrate in profound adoration, without venturing to rise up till the object of their awe is out of sight. Flowers are often scattered from the windows, and the most beautiful nosegays adorn the platform of the movable stage."†

Who, then, can doubt that Romanists worship the host with that external homage with which men should worship God? All the Scriptural marks of an idol are found in this bread-god. It is made by

* See Appendix P.

† Doblado's *Letters from Spain*, p. 308. 8vo. **London, 1822.**

the hands of men, and is liable to outrage, insult, decay, and dissolution. It has been again and again carried into captivity by Moslem soldiers. Romanists say, "We do not adore the host, but Jesus Christ in the host." But what human being ever worshipped stone as stone, or gold as gold? The most debased of the heathen are skilful enough to say, Not the image, but the god in the image, is the object of our homage. To adore the bread as bread, if there be any so utterly lost to humanity, is an offence against the first commandment; to adore our Lord in the bread is an offence against the second commandment; to justify such adoration is to justify all idolatry.

But there are two circumstances connected with this practice which mark its peculiar aggravation. For if men who have the revealed light of heaven to guide them, *will* go astray, they are likely to proceed further, and sink into more profound darkness than those who have been favoured only with the natural lamp of reason. The one circumstance is, that no heathens have been found who believed that an image, or any other object, was transformed or transubstantiated into the person of their god, or the person of their deity transubstantiated into any resemblance or symbol to which they rendered homage. The common idea is, that the god dwells in the image. The second circumstance is, that no idolaters have ever been found to worship what they eat, or to eat what they worship. This is "an extravagance reserved for Popery alone." The Egyptians and Hindoos shudder at the thought of

eating any animal of those species which they esteem to be sacred; far less the individual animals which they may have worshipped. A Mohammedan is reported to have said: "Since the Christians adore what they eat, it is better for us to be of the religion of the philosophers."

Christ's righteousness is the only hope of the sinner; in its place the sacrifice of the mass substitutes an imaginary counterfeit righteousness. The Romish church, not satisfied with this profane extravagance, and with the purpose of keeping the guilty conscience more effectually from the propitiatory sacrifice and atoning death of God's own Son, has introduced the doctrine of *human merit*. There is a treasury, whose contents are at the disposal of the church, consisting of "the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints." Here mark "the working of Satan," in raising the merits of the saints to a level with those of Christ. Dens, in his Theology, speaking of this treasury, says: "In the first place, it is collected from the superabundant satisfactions of Christ; next, from the superfluous satisfactions of the blessed virgin Mary, and of the other saints." * It may well be argued here, if the good works of the saints can form a treasury of merit, they might, during the course of eternal ages, accumulate to such an amount as to render the oblation of the Lord Jesus Christ altogether

* *Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica*, R. et E. D. Petri Dens. Dublinii, 1832. Tom. vi. *De Indulgentiis*, No. 30, p. 417:—"Primario coalescit ex superabundantibus Christi satisfactionibus, deinde ex super-effluentibus beatæ Mariæ Virginis et reliquorum sanctorum satisfactionibus."

unnecessary. If God has appointed, because he deemed it necessary, the crucifixion of his own Son, to form a sufficient and infinite satisfaction for sin, why offer it the highest dishonour by associating therewith the supposed merits of fallen creatures?

The cunning contrivance of the church of Rome, which silently displaces from its rightful and high position the infinitely meritorious righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the sufficient and alone ground of confidence for guilty men, and substitutes in its room the shadowy merit of the mass, and the flimsy merit of the saints, flowing from imaginary works of supererogation, forms not only the foundation of that part of penance called *satisfaction*, but it supplies the fuel which feeds the fires of *purgatory*, and it is also the fruitful source of the tribe of *indulgences*, with their endless and shameless frivolities and vices. The elucidation and illustration of these three subjects would require a volume for each; there is only space in this treatise to refer to their existence, by indicating the great leading error with which they are connected, from which they draw their strength, and to which they lend their aid. "God has granted to our frailty," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that one may satisfy for another." * It is a canonical rule: "He that does not pay in money, must suffer in his body." By these two principles, and the numerous practices founded upon them, the perfect atonement of Immanuel is habitually excluded from the thoughts and affections of the

* *Catechismus Conc. Trid.* Pars ii. cap. v. q. 72.

members of the church of Rome, and in its room is introduced, at one time, the self-inflicted austerities of penance; at another time, the empty merit of shaven priests chanting masses, which, though unsubstantial as air, must invariably be paid for in current coin; and again, the fiction of an indulgence paper, which, purporting to be a genuine bill of exchange upon the exchequer of heaven, is in truth an arrant forgery, filling the purse, and burdening the conscience, of the seller, and beggaring the buyer for time and for eternity.

All the merit that is to be found in the sacrifice of the mass is the merit of exciting abhorrence and execration. "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed," Gal. i. 9. The only merit that is to be found in any guilty creature such as man is liability to death, the wages of sin. The only merit that is to be found in any holy and perfect creature is the merit of avoiding transgression and eschewing condemnation. "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are *unprofitable servants:* we have done that which was our duty to do," Luke xvii. 10. The merits of the Lord Jesus Christ are perfect, inexhaustible, and gratuitously offered to all. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe," Rom. iii. 21, 22.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SACRAMENTS AND OTHER RITES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME OPPOSED TO JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE, AND SANCTIFICATION BY THE WORD AND SPIRIT OF THE LORD.

STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.	DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.
"In order to complete the exposition of the wholesome doctrine of justification, published in the last session, by the unanimous consent of the fathers, it hath been deemed proper to treat of the holy sacraments of the church, by which all true righteousness is at first imparted, then increased, and afterwards restored if lost."	"And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace."—*Luke* vii. 50.
"Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law (baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony,) are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous; or that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these sacraments (although it is granted that they are not all necessary to every	"Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."—*Rom.* iii. 28. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."—*Rom.* v. 1. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—*Mark* xvi. 16. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."—1 *Peter* iii. 21. "Sanctify them through thy

individual): let him be accursed."

"Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by these sacraments of the new law, by their own power (*ex opere operato*), but that faith in the Divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace: let him be accursed."—*Canons of the Council of Trent.* Sess. vii. *Proœm.* can. 4 and 8.*

truth: thy word is truth."—*John* xvii. 17.

"God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."—2 *Thess.* ii. 13.

"The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."—*Gal.* ii. 20.

In the preceding chapter, one of the sacraments was taken into consideration; but the reader is requested to notice, that it was there discussed, not in its strictly ritual aspect, but as possessed of certain elements which have been attached to it by Romanists, and which are peculiar to itself. In the next chapter, also, some portions of the ceremonial of Popery may pass under review, not, however, because they are ceremonial, but because there is combined with them something essentially immoral. In the present chapter, the ritual of the church, properly so called, and regarded exclusively in its ceremonial character, as undegraded by any mixture of absurdity, impiety, or unrighteousness, forms the subject of consideration.

It is not simply a Protestant idea to bring the sacraments and other rites of the church under one category. We shall quote the words of Bailly, one of the acknowledged theologians among our opponents, to justify our arrangement, as it may appear to some unusual. "By ceremonies are to be un-

* See Appendix Q.

derstood the external acts of religion, which were instituted by Christ, his apostles, or the church, for the honour of God, reverence of the sacraments, and to excite the piety of the people. If they are referred to the sacraments, they are called 'sacramental rites.' If they are referred to the worship of God in general, and ordained to the sanctification of man without a sacrament, as prayer in consecrated churches, blessed bread, etc., they are called 'sacramentals,' because they have a kind of likeness to the sacraments."*

The ritual of the Roman church, including the seven sacraments, viewed as a system of ceremonies, obviously divides itself into two portions—*the ceremonies of Divine institution*, and *the ceremonies of human invention*. Between these two classes of rites there is a broad and important distinction—a difference as wide as that between man's presumption and God's authority. It were an act of impiety to lower even for a moment an ordinance of Divine appointment to a level with the best form of will-worship. We charge the church of Rome with being guilty of this offence. The most careless and unlettered reader of the New Testament cannot fail to perceive, that while the observance of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper is obligatory upon all who profess the name of Christ, these rites stand on a sacred pre-eminence, to which they have been raised by our Lord himself, and which, consequently, they should occupy to the exclusion of all others. The church of Rome,

* Bailly. *Theol.*, vol. iii. cap. 8.

by attempting to elevate to this hallowed height, and introduce within this holy inclosure, five strangers which have neither an external commission nor internal character that can warrant the attempt, manifests a purpose to turn order into confusion, and to confound things human with things Divine.

It is not our purpose to assail any form of worship simply because it is a human invention. The New Testament does not give such lengthened and particular directions as to all the details of the public worship of God, as to exclude all opportunity of Christians following, within due limits, the suggestions of their own devout minds. There is no church now in existence, nor is there likely to be any, in which everything observed in the celebration of Divine service can be sustained by direct apostolical precept or example. It is, then, neither safe nor tenable to condemn and reject any mode of worship simply on the ground that it is a human device. But it is the duty of every Christian to raise his protest against any party that would array the fairest product of mere human wisdom in the sacred robe of Divine authority; and thus protect himself and his neighbour in the enjoyment of that liberty wherewith Christ hath made his people free.

There are surely few who will deny that the perversion of a Divine ordinance may proceed to such a length as to be equally criminal and equally pernicious, though in a different form, as the effort that would make a human invention obligatory upon every conscience. The abuse of God's gift

is generally accompanied with undue regard for our own contrivances. The doctors of the church first learned to distort the truth, and then to teach for doctrines the commandments of men. While a Heaven-ordained institution maintains its Scriptural integrity, it will not readily yield a share of its place to any human device; but let the former be corrupted and prostituted, and the way is opened for the entrance of a whole tribe of illegitimate observances. Both errors grow from one root, and they are generally found to be suggested by the same unworthy motives and to promote the same unholy ends.

The fundamental and fatal error of the church of Rome in this matter is, *attributing a spiritual efficacy to a manual performance, asserting that Divine grace flows in a material channel, and teaching that God's blessing is to be obtained by mere bodily exercise.* This evil is augmented by consigning all ecclesiastical rites to the irresponsible charge of the priesthood. And it is further augmented by the introduction of human inventions to an equality with Divine ordinances. Every addition to the rites of a church, in which the doctrine of sacramental grace is shedding its deleterious influence, is an advance towards the complete and unmitigated bondage of ceremonialism. The slavery of a rigid ritual is immediately connected with the tyranny of priestcraft; for every rite must be either sanctioned or administered by the priest. As the tyranny of the priesthood increases, true godliness declines; and as the bondage of a ritual

deepens, the freedom and purity which grow from faith in Christ, droop and sicken and die.

Looking at our subject in this aspect, the same unhappy influence may be found, and in fact is found, in the Romish church, hovering around the ordinances of the New Testament, the other ceremonies which the church has been pleased to style sacraments, and the other numerous rites which are not sacramental. The observance of a rite may rest upon the sanction of heaven, or upon the authority of the church, or upon the preference or the worshipper. Such differences are not for a moment to be overlooked, or their importance to be under-estimated. But if in each instance, and from a similar cause, the rite becomes the source of a malignant moral malaria, their differences may for a time be disregarded, to concentrate our attention upon their agreement. Let the bare observance of a rite be esteemed efficacious in obtaining pardon and promoting sanctity, and then, we apprehend, that the one which has nothing to recommend it but the choice of an individual, having to him "a show of wisdom in will-worship," will be the least detrimental; the rite which is supported by the custom of antiquity and ecclesiastical authority will, in such a case, be injurious in a much higher degree; while a Divine institution, thus perverted from its original design, and made subservient to some base disposition of humanity, is likely to prove the most pernicious of all. (See Gal. iv. 9—11; Col. ii. 20—23.) It may be allowed us, therefore, for the present at least, to regard as

a secondary question, what specifically are the ordinances, or the rudiments, or the beggarly elements which are supposed to be clothed with spiritual virtue, or impregnated with holy influences; for, whether they be many or few, whether they be seldom or frequently observed, whether they have been sent from heaven or born on earth, the malady is the same in all. Such diversities only indicate different phases of this religious disease, which is of the most pestilential character.

The Council of Trent has given the following definition of a sacrament:—"A sacrament is a thing subject to the senses, and possessing, by Divine institution, at once the power of signifying sanctity and justice, and of imparting both to the receiver."* The application of the word "sacrament" to baptism and the Lord's supper is not sanctioned by remote antiquity; for the expression, "sacramentum," was at first employed by the Latin fathers as synonymous with mystery, as we find it used in the New Testament (for example, in Eph. i. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 16), where it means a sacred thing which lay concealed till it was revealed by God to man. But it is of more consequence to observe, that by the Tridentine definition of a sacrament, as by the whole policy of the church of Rome, the distinction between justification and sanctification is completely obliterated. Justification is an act of God—the acquittal of our Judge, the pronouncing of pardon. Sanctification is the process carried on in the heart of the discharged criminal,

* *Catechismus Conc. Trid.* Pars ii. cap. i. q. 8.

by which he is purified and perfected. The one is deliverance from the condemnation of the law; the other is emancipation from the bondage and love of sin. The one removes the curse of transgression; the other removes its consequences. Through justification, the guilty may obtain at once perfect comfort; through sanctification, they attain by degrees a perfect character.

But let us, for a little, consider the arguments by which the church of Rome defends the institution of *seven* sacraments. The Council of Trent unblushingly anathematizes every one who "shall affirm that the seven sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord."* In defence of this canon of an unerring council, the doctors of the church, we believe, can produce nothing more cogent than what has been supplied by the acute ingenuity of Peter Dens:—"The number seven is insinuated in various places of Scripture; thus in Prov. ix. 1, Wisdom, which is Christ, hath built her house, that is, the church, and hath cut out her seven pillars, to wit, the seven sacraments, which, as so many pillars, sustain the church. Thus, in like manner, in Exod. xxv., by the seven lights which were in one candlestick, this is insinuated; for the seven sacraments are, as it were, so many lights which illuminate the church."† It would be more consistent with the tenor of the word of God, and with the facts of history, to compare the seven sacraments of Rome, in the hands of her

* *Conc. Trid.* Sess. vii. can. 1.

† Dens. tom. v., no. 46, page 140.

priesthood, to the seven kine, "poor and very ill-favoured, and lean-fleshed, such as Pharaoh had never seen in all the land of Egypt for badness," which did eat up the seven fat kine; for so have the beauty and fertility of the Chrisian church been consumed by sacramental doctrine. There may be more than an incidental similitude in number between the seven sacraments of Popery, and the seven heads and seven crowns of the great red dragon, Rev. xii. 3.

The above statement of the Tridentine assembly is not in harmony with what is taught in some of the authorized catechisms of the Romish church. In a catechism published at Rome in 1815, and in another published at Dublin in 1840, the time when confirmation, penance, extreme unction, and matrimony were instituted as sacraments, is declared to be uncertain.* How feeble, then, as well as false, is the decree of the infallible council which asserts that the seven sacraments were all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ!

Another specimen of argumentation on this point is here added, which is of no mean celebrity, and of no small authority in the Romish church, and whose refutation we leave to the judgment of the reader. In order to exist, to preserve existence, to contribute to his own and the public good, seven things seem necessary to man: (1) To be born; (2) to grow; (3) to be nurtured; (4) to be cured when sick; (5) when weak, to be strengthened;

* See *Popery Delineated.* By the Rev. T. Hartwell Horne. London, 1848. pp. 137—139.

(6) as far as regards the public weal, to have magistrates invested with authority to govern; (7) and finally, to perpetuate himself and his species by legitimate offspring.—Analogous, then, as all these things obviously are to that life by which the soul lives to God, we discover in them a reason to account for the number of the sacraments: (1) Baptism is the gate to all the other sacraments, by which we are born again to Christ; (2) confirmation, by which we grow up and are strengthened in the grace of God; (3) the eucharist, the true bread from heaven, which nourishes our souls to eternal life; (4) penance, by which the soul that has caught the contagion of sin, is restored to spiritual life; (5) extreme unction, which obliterates the traces of sin, and invigorates the powers of the soul; (6) holy orders, which give power to perpetuate in the church the public administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of all the sacred functions of the ministry; (7) matrimony, a sacrament instituted for the legitimate and holy union of man and woman, for the worship of God and conservation of the human race, and the religious education of children.*

We now resume the general argument of this chapter. It is an immediate and natural result of the ritual theory of the church of Rome, that *a priest living in mortal sin can validly administer the sacraments*. This opinion we find uniformly inculcated in the teaching and practice of the church. If the efficacy of a ceremony reside in

* *Catechism of the Council of Trent.* Pars ii. cap. i. q. 15.

the ceremony itself, it is clearly a subordinate question as to the hands through which it ought properly to pass. A gold coin is not deteriorated by passing through the hands of a condemned criminal. But into what an awful blackness of moral night must the popedom have sunk, before it could pledge itself (and, as usual, under an anathema) to the shocking idea that a profligate man, by going through the acts of a short drama, can regenerate or sanctify an immortal soul!*

The absurdity of the doctrine of the Romish church on this subject is still more obvious, when we consider what she teaches respecting the *intention* of the priest in administering the sacraments. The Tridentine Council has decreed, that "whoever

* The remarks of the Duke of Argyle on the rites of the Christian religion are so apposite, that it will be beneficial to introduce them here:—"It is their purpose to remind us of facts, and by so doing, to keep alive that frame of mind which God requires of us, when we do remember them. We are not called to exercise faith in them; but they call us to exercise faith in things which they bring to mind, not so much symbolically, as commemoratively. There is danger enough, surely, that the mere performance of rites should occupy that place in our religion which is due only to the use we make of them; but how much is that danger increased when we systematically exaggerate the importance, not merely of the rites, but of what may be called the accidents of their administration! To expect spiritual blessings from the efficacy of a rite, is perilous enough; it *must* take us very near the edge of our Christian faith; it may take us into that ritual idolatry which lies wholly outside the boundary; but if, advancing still further in this direction, in which we are naturally inclined to go, we interpose between ourselves and the efficacy of the rite, the efficacy of a ceremonial priesthood, we indeed give ourselves a tremendous impetus down the steep descent which has led, and must lead, to the coarsest idolatry of Rome."

shall affirm that when ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should have at least the intention to do what the church does: let him be accursed." * Cardinal Bellarmine draws a very logical conclusion from this decree, when he says that "no one can be certain with the certainty of faith that he receives a true sacrament, since a sacrament cannot be celebrated without the minister's intention; and no one can see the intention of another." † The refutation of both council and cardinal we shall leave to one of the fathers of Trent, Ambrogio Caterino, bishop of Minori, who thus addressed the assembled bishops: "Consider how a tender father would be afflicted, when his son was about to die, if he doubted of the intention of the baptizing priest. So he that feeleth himself of a weak disposition, and is to be baptized, what anxiety will he have, that perhaps the priest is a counterfeit Christian, and mocketh him, not meaning to baptize him, but only to wash him in jest. And the same may be feared in confession, and receiving the eucharist." He added, "If any said these cases were rare, would to God it were so, and that in this corrupt age we had not cause to doubt they were many. But suppose they are very few, or but one only. Let there be a knave priest, who feigneth, and hath not an intention to administer the true baptism to a child, who, after being a man grown, is created bishop of a great city, and liveth many years in that charge, so that he hath ordained a great part of the priests, it must be said, that

* Sess. vii. can. ii. † See Appendix R.

he being not baptized, is not ordained, nor they ordained who are promoted by him. So, in that great city, there will be neither eucharist nor confession, because they cannot be without the sacrament of order, nor order without a true bishop; neither can he receive order who is not baptized. Behold millions of nullities of sacraments, by the malice of one minister, in one act only." *

The Romish church uniformly *represents her ritual worship as more necessary than faith.*† The catechism of Trent, for example, declares that, without baptism, children "are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction."‡ And again, "In baptism not only is sin forgiven, but with it all the punishment due to sin is remitted by a merciful God."§ This doctrine is directly opposed to the lessons of the Gospel, and is replete with infinite danger to the souls of men. Human nature requires to be constantly driven from its confidence in religious rites, not lured to its indulgence. The master of a merchant-vessel, in which his whole fortune is embarked, though overtaken by a storm, by which the sails are rent and the helm unshipped, will not immediately leave his ship. Not till a leak is sprung, and the deck of the foundering vessel reaches the ocean's edge, will he consent to quit his charge, and, to save his life, leap into a boat. So

* *The History of the Council of Trent*, written in Italian by Pietro Soave Polano, and faithfully translated into English by Nathanael Brent. London, 1640. Lib. ii. p. 241.

† See extracts at the beginning of the chapter.

‡ *Catech. Conc. Trid.* Pars ii. cap. ii. q. 30.

§ *Ibid.* Pars ii. cap. ii. q. 44.

is it with the sinner, whose vessel is his own righteousness, carrying the invaluable cargo of his eternal interests. He may be overtaken by some trouble, which shall lead him to feel, and even force him to acknowledge, the utter vanity of the world, and the great iniquity of his own heart, and which shall pass away, leaving him far from prepared to abandon entirely and for ever his self-righteous hopes. Not till he is fully persuaded that all his works and merits and ceremonies are not only worthless before God, but that in relying upon them for salvation, even in the smallest degree, he is trusting to a ship which in a stormy surge has sprung an irreparable leak, and is quickly and certainly sinking into unfathomed depths, will he decidedly and joyfully leap into the life-boat of salvation; or, in other words, unreservedly confide in the alone merits of our great High Priest, Jesus, the Son of God.

Grace is declared to be the general effect of all the sacraments, and is spoken of, by Romanist divines, as primary and secondary. The primary grace conferred by the sacraments supposes that there is no habitual grace pre-existing, and makes him just who was formerly unjust. Secondary grace supposes that there is pre-existing grace, and makes a just man more just. Thus faith in Christ is completely ignored and superseded—that faith which peremptorily excludes all that priests can promise or perform, all that penance can achieve, all that wealth can purchase, all that toil can produce, and all that virtue can secure. Faith in Christ is that act of the soul in performing which

a man feels that he is performing the most important act of his life-time; that its performance is unequivocally and absolutely necessary; and that it may not for a moment be deferred, seeing an instant's delay may plunge him into irretrievable ruin. The folly of procrastination rankles like a barbed arrow in the mind of a thoroughly awakened sinner. The iron grasp of a stern necessity seems to lay hold on his sensitive spirit. The importance of his eternity presses like a huge load upon his agitated breast. Gathering up, therefore, all the energies of his nature, and enlisting all the feelings of his heart, and stretching to the very utmost the resolution of his will, *he forsakes all that he has*, and casts himself, in penitence and faith, at the feet of Immanuel.

The evil of substituting the observance of rites for the actings of faith is rendered more intense by an almost endless multiplication of ceremonies. The different classes of these are pointed out in the following sentence: *orans, tinctus, edens, confessus, dans, benedicens*—praying, aspersed, eating, confessed, giving, blessing. The following practices are usually observed in the administration of *baptism*. There is first the exorcism, the object of which is to expel the devil; then the priest puts a little blessed salt into the mouth of the person to be baptized; then his forehead, eyes, breast, shoulders, and ears are signed with the sign of the cross; next the priest recites another exorcism, touching with a little spittle the ears and nostrils of the recipient. Just before the rite is administered, the priest

anoints the individual with holy oil on the breast and between the shoulders; after its administration, the priest anoints the crown of his head with the oil of chrism, arrays him in a white garment, and puts a burning light into his hand. In *extreme unction* there are seven anointings: for the eyes, the ears, the nose, the mouth, the hands, the breast, and the feet. In the case of the eyes and other double organs, each is anointed during one pronouncing of the form. The form is as follows: "By this holy unction, and through his great mercy, may God indulge thee whatever sins thou hast committed by sight, etc. Amen." * When an organ is deficient, the places where it should be are anointed. The anointing is in the form of a cross, and is sometimes performed by the priest's thumb, and sometimes by a rod. The following are some of the *penances*, which may be enjoined, according to Dens' Theology, under the head of prayer: To say five Paternosters, and five Ave Marias, in memory of the five wounds of Christ, either with bended knees or outstretched arms; to recite the rosary or litanies of the virgin Mary; to read the seven penitential psalms; to hear mass; to read a chapter in Thomas à Kempis; to visit churches; to renew ejaculatory prayers as often as the sound of a clock is heard.† We shall give an example of another kind. There is at Rome a flight of twenty-eight stone steps, said to have been taken

* *Garden of the Soul*, p. 233.

† Dens' *Theology*, tom. vi. (*De Satisfactione Sacramentali.* No. 176), p. 247.

from the palace of Pontius Pilate at Jerusalem, and known by the name of *Santa Scala*. Up these steps multitudes of young and old, rich and poor, fat and lean, may be seen climbing on their bended knees; their contortions, groans, jostlings, and prayers affording a strange spectacle to every traveller. The motive stimulating to all this exertion and self-denial, is the promise of an indulgence for nine years for every step of the ascent which is traversed on his knees by the zealous devotee.

These are but samples of the ten thousand opiates which Rome manufactures and sells for the relief of uneasy consciences. Whoever, under an apprehension of the wrath of God, applies for direction to a Romish priest, is forthwith sent to the ceremonial treadmill. The severer the compunctions of conscience, the more is the ritual burden increased. Rather than let go her victim, the church will multiply and prolong her exactions till the individual, if his convictions be of the more settled and appalling kind, is overcome by sheer physical suffering, and as the necessary result of exhaustion, he sinks into the stupor of an unnatural repose. How different the method pursued by Divine mercy!—"Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," Rom. v. 1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," Rom. viii. 1. It is difficult to conceive, it is still more difficult to describe, what is involved in the word "condemnation." In it are combined all the most

potent elements of misery; it proceeds from the lips of the most high and most mighty God; it is sanctioned by the most holy and immutable jurisprudence; it is inflicted upon a being more precious a thousandfold than all the mere material creation; and it inflicts upon that being the last degree of desolation and anguish that an intelligent creature can endure. This condemnation, which is so unspeakably dreadful, and which is resting, in all its undiminished and unqualified rigour, upon every impenitent human soul, does, in the hour of "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," rise from off the burdened spirit, and pass away entirely and for ever—as the deep shades of night roll away from before the morning sun; or as the Assyrian army, which besieged the holy city of old, perished in a watch of the night under the stroke of the angel of Jehovah. The arrows of conviction in your heart, O sinful man, may be thousands of thousands; you may feel yourself encompassed, above, beneath, and around, by the terrors of the Lord, more numerous than the aggregate of many armies, and more dreadful than the most formidable weapons of war; but faith in the Lord Jesus, as the Divine and only Saviour of the lost, is able, without delay, to blunt and break the arrows of remorse, to discomfit and destroy the consolidated squadrons of your fears, though they may be bristling with all the woes of hell, and covered with all the artillery of heaven's wrath. "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that

believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God," John iii. 18.

"Like the lightnings of heaven when the storm is nigh,
The fears of the guilt-stricken conscience run high;
Like the sunshine of heaven when the storm is spent,
Forth beams the pure peace that to faith has been sent."

The ritual of the church of Rome not only invalidates and nullifies the doctrine of justification by faith alone, but with equally fatal success *conceals and neutralizes the Scriptural views of sanctification.* Sanctifying grace is said to be the effect of all the sacraments, as in the following canon of the Council of Trent:—"Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or that they do not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way, as if they were only the external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of Christian profession, whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers: let him be accursed."* Moreover, each sacrament, it is affirmed, confers grace peculiar to itself, subservient to the special end for which the sacrament is appointed. This peculiar grace is what is usually indicated by the expression, "sacramental grace." Thus, baptism is said to bestow *regenerating* grace; which is *strengthened* and *augmented* by the grace of confirmation. The sanctifying grace of the eucharist *nourishes* spiritual life, and, by producing fervent acts of obedience, *unites* man to God. The soul is

* *Conc. Trid.* Sess vii. can. 6.

repaired and *revived* in a spiritual manner by the grace of penance. The grace conferred by extreme unction is especially *sanative* to the soul. The grace of orders is ministrative; and by that of matrimony, man and wife are united, and concupiscence is restrained.

How widely different, how infinitely superior to such statements, is the Scriptural doctrine of sanctification! To its attainment there are three indispensable pre-requisites—the Bible, which is the word of God; grace, which is the gift of the Spirit; and faith, which is the action of the man himself: as no harvest can be reaped without the seed of the sower, the sunshine of heaven, and the toil of the husbandman.

The word of God, and not a routine of ceremonies, is the instrumental agency in our sanctification. (See John xvii. 17; Eph. v. 26; 1 Pet. ii. 2; Psa. xix. 7, 8; 2 Tim. iii. 16.) The church of Rome having done what she could to deprive the people of this agency, the better to conceal the enormity of the wrong thus inflicted, has turned her churches into theatres, where certain portions of the Gospel history are set forth in the form of dramatic representations. Thus her ceremonies are augmented, the word of God more securely sealed, the undue influence of the sacraments confirmed, and the midnight of grossest formalism settles down upon the minds of the people. We subjoin an illustration. The dramatic representations of the touching incidents of that part of our Lord's history when he washed his disciples' feet,

is called the "Lavanda," and is performed regularly in Rome in our own times. "The Lavanda, or washing, takes place in one of the transepts in St. Peter's, which is well arranged for the spectacle. A platform or stage is erected of sufficient height to enable everything to be seen by all who may desire to be present. The tapestry woven from the celebrated fresco of Leonardo da Vinci, representing the Last Supper, is suspended above this stage, which is admirably arranged. High above all, and against the wall, is an elevated bench, on which are seated thirteen men,* to represent the apostles of our Lord. They are clothed in dresses like white flannel, and wear caps of a conical form, like those worn among the Persians. As they are seated thus, the pope enters, accompanied by the officers of state: one carries a silver-gilt basin of water; a second carries thirteen towels; a third has thirteen bouquets of flowers; and a fourth carries twenty-six medals. The pope approaches the bench of the apostles, which is so high and so well managed that their knees are on a level with the head of the pope and his attendants; so that his holiness is spared the necessity of stooping, in order to the washing their feet, which immediately commences. A deacon of the church raises the foot of the first apostle, an attendant hands a towel to the pope, he dips it into the silver-gilt basin, he touches the instep raised before him, he kisses the washed foot, he receives a bouquet of flowers from another attendant, presents it to the apostle, desires two medals to be presented

* Various reasons are assigned for this number.

by his treasurer, and moves to the next. A deacon of the church raises the foot of the next apostle to be washed, and the same ceremony continues till every right foot is raised, every apostle washed and kissed, every bouquet disposed of, and two medals presented to each, on which the ceremony concludes, and his holiness retires." * A similar scene of childish frivolity takes place at the "Tavola," or last supper. While it is in perfect harmony with the general theory and practice of the papacy, that the pope should, on such occasions, act the part of our blessed Lord himself, this fact renders the performance of such dramas somewhat worse than frivolous and childish. It chiefly concerns our present purpose to remark, that it is by such a ceremonial medley of what is trifling and profane, that the infallible church would supply the place of the Holy Scriptures, supplement the deficiencies of "sacramental grace," and nourish the perverted minds of her deluded victims.

The other indispensable pre-requisites to the attainment of sanctification are, grace, which is the gift of God's free Spirit (2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 2, 22), and faith, which is the acting of the sinner's soul. The human heart is so thoroughly disordered and so deeply polluted, that no hand but the hand of its Maker can rectify and cleanse it. The hand of the highest archangel cannot touch effectively the secret springs of the human soul, and restore it to its primitive integrity, or reach the hidden depths of the human heart, and purge

* Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 238.

it of its indescribable filthiness. This is the work of the Divine Spirit. He touches, as none but the Creator can touch, man's debased and corrupted mind, and thereby restores spiritual life. By the alone guidance and aid of the same gracious and sovereign Spirit, the quickened soul advances in Scriptural knowledge, in holy activity, and in spiritual comfort; that is, in sanctification.

But the exercise of faith is equally as necessary as the written word, or the quickening Spirit, Acts xv. 9, xxvi. 18; Heb. xi. 6. No man believes any truth of the Gospel without the almighty grace of the Holy Ghost; but the necessity of receiving this grace neither removes nor relaxes our obligation to believe. The actings of faith are quite as indispensable to growth in holiness, as the perusal of the Divine word, or the gift of the Divine Spirit; for without faith we can neither learn the preciousness of the one, nor experience the power of the other.

The Holy Spirit in the work of sanctification does not destroy man's will, but directs it; does not enfeeble his activity, but ennobles it. Neither cheap Bibles, nor an orthodox creed, far less the ceaseless, savourless mummeries of Roman worship, will bring us to resemble God in holy character, unless our desires are going forth upon, and delighting in, the great truths of revelation, and our hearts are embracing and pleading the promises of the Spirit. The gaudy and gross formalism of Popery may be renounced, only to make room for the lighter and severer formality of Protestantism.

It is the doctrine of the church of Rome, as we

have seen, that the sacraments not only signify, but also contain and confer grace, as instruments of Divine appointment. When Romanists are asked to explain *the manner* in which grace resides in, or flows from, the sacraments, great variety of sentiment is found to prevail among them. And again, when an explanation of "*character*," which is asserted to be the secondary effect of baptism, confirmation, and orders, is requested, each doctor almost is found to have an opinion of his own. One represents it to be a mere "extrinsic denomination;" another, "a real relation:" one calls it "a patible quality;" another, "a habit:" the Council of Trent defines it to be "a spiritual indelible sign impressed on the mind."* Thus we perceive that, in this case, as in many others, their boasted unanimity of sentiment is really as changeful as the ever-shifting aspect of the clouds. In one point, however, all Romanists agree, that character is the invariable result of receiving three of the sacraments, and grace is the essential element evolved in the administration of them all. The church of Rome in effect says: The just shall live by the performance of rites. The word of God says: "The just shall live by faith"—namely, in Christ, the written word, and the promised Spirit.†

* *Conc. Trid.* Sess. vii. can. 9.

† We have excluded from the present chapter, as already intimated, ceremonies directly involving anything irreverent or immoral. This, then, seems to be the only opportunity we shall have of introducing a sample of some of the more contemptible and ridiculous rites which are patronised and practised by the church of Rome. Modern travellers in Italy are sometimes in-

clined to commend the post-horses to whose services they are indebted; and the usual reply of the postillion is, that they have been blessed by the priest. An account of this ceremony, as given by a recent eye witness, may prove interesting:—

"The ludicrous part of the scene was when some luckless wight had to conduct some obstinate mule, or some sulky ass, to the priest. The crowd made it their business to shout and halloo so as to terrify the animal, and often to make it still more obstinate and sulky than before. There they jested and jeered with untiring assiduity at the poor fellow, till the mule, or the ass, plunging violently, would sometimes fling the rider to the ground; and sometimes, when brought almost within reach, and the priest would raise his brush to sprinkle the water, the animal would again dart away, scared at the sight of his robes, the raising of his arm, and the waving of his brush. It was at such moments that the mirth and merriment of the crowding people would become uproarious. The priest, at times, fell in good-naturedly with the humour of the people, and would, intentionally, give such a flourish of his brush and arm as was sure to scare the animal; and then hats were waved, and hands were clapped, and the cheer went round, and round again, till the frighted animals became wholly unmanageable, and were obliged to be brought sometimes by main force within reach of the holy water. At times, asses were dragged by main force applied to their tails, going backwards with no very graceful steps to receive the blessing of St. Anthony. It seemed to a stranger as if the evil of all others most dreaded by the unwilling and unbelieving animals, was their participation in this blessing of the saint. Altogether, it was a strange and comical scene, and such a scene as could only be witnessed among a laughter-loving and superstitious people. The wildest and merriest scenes at Donnybrook-fair have never surpassed the scenes at the church of St. Anthony. There is, however, this difference—in Donnybrook, there is no pretence to religion, and no mockery of religion; but in Rome, the jugglers and mountebanks are priests, and all is done in the name of religion. Instead of the motley dress of a clown, there are the sacred robes of a priest—all is transacted at the doors of the church. The words of prayer are uttered; the form of blessing is pronounced; the holy water is sprinkled; the money is paid; the church of Rome patronises the scene, and her priests and monks thrive upon the profits."—Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome* p. 404.

CHAPTER VIII.

MAXIMS AND PRACTICES OF POPERY OPPOSED TO THE MORAL LAW.

"Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."—MATTHEW v. 17.

EVERY error in religion is immediately and intimately connected with some misconception regarding the law of God. Any doubt respecting its unchangeable character and obligation, or respecting the perfection of the obedience which it demands, or respecting the eternity of unutterable woe which is to be inflicted upon the transgressor, directly affects and injures the due estimation in which the atonement of Christ ought to be held. Any defect in our appreciation of the redemption purchased by the Lord Jesus, is universally accompanied by coldness in devotion, or carelessness in duty. The thunders of the law, rightly perceived, shake and shatter and destroy every refuge of the guilty but the Rock of ages, Jesus Christ. And, if it be admitted that the Son of God died to save men from the curse of the broken law, it seems the last absurdity to suppose that the re-

deemed could have any license, or any wish, to break that law. But let the great fact of God's revelation, that Christ was made a curse for us, have its brightness shaded, or its position altered, or a substitute for it introduced, and that moment the law is shorn of its integrity and power. To the sincere and intelligent believer in the gospel, and to him alone, lukewarmness in piety and laxity in practice seem equally unreasonable and equally criminal. We have seen how Popery had its origin, among other causes, in a misconception of the moral law. That law being misunderstood, or rather disregarded, the way was prepared for the introduction of human righteousness to mimic, supersede, and rival the Divine righteousness of Christ; and thus a path was opened for the plain and avowed violation of many of the commandments.

It were obviously out of place to speak of transgressions of the moral law committed by individual Romanists, uncountenanced by, or in opposition to, the principles of their church; or of such as may be considered by her enemies as legitimate consequences fairly deducible from the doctrines of the papacy. Our present purpose is with those immoralities which the symbolical books of the church of Rome directly sanction and recommend, and those which her authorized leaders have perpetrated, and defended, as being supported and demanded by the principles of their system. Our remarks shall be arranged under the three following particulars: *Idolatry*, *Deception*, and *Persecution*.

IDOLATRY.

STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.	DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.
"I constantly hold that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated; that they offer prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be venerated. "I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, and of the mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them."—*Creed of pope Pius IV.**	"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."—*Exod.* xx. 3—6.

The Council of Trent has no anathema for those who differ from her decrees in this matter, but she commands all bishops and others "to labour with diligent assiduity to instruct the faithful concerning the invocation and intercession of the saints, the honour due to relics, and the lawful use of images; teaching them that the saints who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men; that it is a good and useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help, and assistance."†

It is no doubt the inconsistency which exists

* See Appendix S.

† *Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxv.

between such statements as the above, and the requirements of the second commandment, that has led the church of Rome to omit that commandment in most of the catechisms published for the instruction of youth, in those countries where her advocates *can venture* to omit it.*

The high antiquity of *demonolatry* in the professing church of Christ is a fact that cannot now be either denied or concealed. While this fact is to all rightly-disposed minds exquisitely painful, and suggestive of the most self-abasing reflections, it is at the same time replete with the most valuable instruction, and speaks to every Christian in the loudest notes of faithful warning. We quote from an author to whom we are already under obligations :—

"The devotion paid to relics, and the miraculous benefits alleged to emanate from the shrines of the martyrs, constituted a sort of transition ground between those more vague invocations of the saints with which the orators of this (the Nicene) age usually conclude their commemoration harangues,

* To make up for this omission, perhaps, there are found in many catechisms what are called the commandments of the church, which are binding under penalty of mortal sin. They are given in Dr. Reilly's *Catechism* (published at Dublin in 1834) thus :—

"1. Sundays and holy days mass thou shalt hear.
"2. All holy days sanctify through the year.
"3. Lent, Ember days, and vigils, thou shalt fast.
"4. Fridays and Saturdays, flesh thou shalt not taste.
"5. In Lent and Advent, nuptial feasts forbear.
"6. Confess your sins at least once every year.
"7. Receive your God about great Easter-day,
"8. And to his church neglect not tithes to pay."

and the direct worship of the images and pictures of these divinities. The common people, encouraged as they were to call upon a favourite saint for help, and to expect miraculous aid while bending before his shrine, would not fail to look up to the image, or bas-relief, or gaudy picture itself, and to address to it their supplications, whenever the opportunity so to do was afforded. Let it be considered what would inevitably be the popular practices resulting from declamations such as the following, when addressed to a people lately reclaimed from polytheism, and still surrounded by it. The passage occurs at the close of the long homily commemorative of SS. Bernice and Prosdoce,—saints, by the way, not included in the Roman calendar. Alas! that a divine like Chrysostom should have believed it to be his duty to relate, and with commendation, such a story! A mother plunges with her two daughters into a river, and thus while 'marrying them to Christ,' she 'baptized' them also, as well as obtained for them and for herself, as by force, the crown of martyrdom—a story both in itself and in its principle utterly to be reprobated: but whom the church had canonized, the preacher must commend; and commend them, too, at the cost of the first axioms of Christian morality. 'Let mothers listen, let virgins listen; those, that they may thus instruct their daughters; these, that they may thus obey their mothers.' By what means the church had obtained possession of the bones of these drowned martyrs, does not appear: their shrines, however, were perpetually resorted to

by the people, who thence derived innumerable benefits. 'You are inflamed, I warrant,' says Chrysostom, 'with a passionate affection towards these saints. Let us then with this very fire of love fall down before their relics. Let us embrace their shrines, for in truth the shrines of the martyrs are of great efficacy, even as the bones of the martyrs possess great force. And not only on this the day of the festival, but on other days also, let us beset them, let us beseech them, let us invoke them, that they would deign to become our patrons. For great confidence (boldness) have they, not living merely, but as dead; ay, much more as dead. For now they bear the stigmas (marks of martyrdom) of Christ; and while showing these stigmas, they are able to persuade the King to anything. Since then their power is such, and such their favour with God, when we have, with a continued assiduity and a perpetual frequenting of their society (at their shrines), made ourselves, as it were, their familiar friends, by their means we shall obtain for ourselves the loving-kindness of God, which that we may all enjoy,' etc.* If only two or three detached passages of this sort occurred in the writings of the Nicene divines, we should peremptorily refuse to regard them as genuine; but, in fact, the same pernicious sentiments, and the same evidence as to facts, meet the eye in more places than could be soon enumerated; while incidental allusions to the corresponding observances of the church, and to popular practices therewith agreeing, are equally

* See Appendix T.

frequent, and, if possible, still more conclusive." The above, along with other evidence, puts beyond doubt—"1. Chrysostom's personal and cordial approval of demonolatrous worship. 2. The universality of these superstitions; or the fact that the Christianized people of the fourth century practised, in these respects, whatever is now characteristic of the Greek and Roman communions. And 3. By an unavoidable inference, that these practices were then not of very recent origin."*

It may be said that the foregoing lengthened extract is not an illustration of the idolatry of Popery. Fully aware of this objection, we have, nevertheless, preferred the above to a great number of others which lie ready at hand, and that for various reasons. 1. If the idolatry of the Nicene church be not the idolatry of Popery, it is unquestionably popish idolatry. It is a fair sample of Romish superstition—an average specimen of the staple article by which many nations have been drugged, and millions of souls deluded, during more than fourteen centuries. 2. Such illustrations are the best antidote, next to the Bible and the grace of God, to the most subtle form in which Popery is making its advances in our own land at the present time. The Tractarians would take us back to the Nicene fathers as our authoritative teachers and guides in Christian doctrine and practice. It cannot be too extensively known that they who would follow implicitly the church of the fourth and fifth centuries, stand thereby pledged

* *Ancient Christianity*, vol. ii. pp. 192—194.

to a debasing form of idolatry. 3. The foregoing extract aids the illustration of what has been already advanced on the rise and progress of Popery, and helps to show how priests and people, by working into each other's hands, and conjointly yielding themselves to the influence of an obvious error, contributed effectively and guiltily to the erection of the monstrous fabric of the papacy. 4. And hence, Protestants and Protestant churches, especially those which are free from external restraints, may well learn a lesson of caution, lest teachers and taught should be found encouraging each other in thoughtless subjection to some palpable error, whose full development may bring shame and desolation upon the church of a future age.

We deem it unnecessary to enter into a formal refutation of idolatry. The only question that can be raised is, Does this charge, when made against any party, rest upon sufficient evidence? No man, we believe, ever worshipped a picture as a picture and nothing more, or a stone as a mere stone. If such practices only are to be characterized as idolatry, it would be difficult to substantiate the charge against any of the human race. He who prostrates himself before what he believes to be nothing else but a senseless piece of matter, seems to abjure and abandon the last vestige of his humanity. To worship any supposed superior invisible power, other than the supreme God, is a violation of the first commandment. To worship the only living and true God, or any supposed deity, through the

medium of image, picture, or relic, is opposed to the second commandment. The distinction of adoration into different kinds, *dulia*, *hyperdulia*, and *latria*, is unreasonable and unscriptural, and, besides, is too refined to be perceived by the minds of the common people. It is of some consequence to notice that the creed of pope Pius IV. (as already quoted) expressly teaches that due honour and veneration are to be given to the *images* of Christ, Mary, and the *other saints*. The facts which we shall now produce are sufficient of themselves to determine the question, Whether or not Romanists *are still giving* to another the glory due to God alone?

Mariolatry in Italy and Rome is so gross, extensive, and notorious, that the traveller is constrained to exclaim, The religion of this people is the religion of Mary, not the religion of Christ; while the more intelligent of the priests cannot deny that appearances are such as to render the exclamation natural and well founded. An Italian may forget God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, but he cannot forget Mary and the saints. Go where he may, there is not a corner of the land, and scarce an hour of his existence, that a Madonna is not presented to his eye, and forced upon his attention. The effect of this frequency of presentation is vastly enhanced by the beauty and artistic excellency of many of the paintings. One or two illustrations must suffice. "In one of the most fashionable churches of Rome, that of S. Carlo Borromeo, is a very large painting of the virgin Mary, with this inscription, '*Tu sola*

interemisti universas hæreses'—Thou only hast destroyed all heresies.*

In the church Scalzi, at Venice, there is an altar-piece, which is usually called a "Holy Family," representing the child Jesus, with Joseph and Mary, and under it is this inscription, "Jesus, Joseph, Mary, by whom are all things."† When our Saviour is introduced along with his mother, he generally occupies an inferior position. In the painting just noticed, he is represented as a child; and very frequently he is seen as a babe in Mary's arms, as if for no other purpose than to distinguish her from other saints. This conception has its absurdity fully developed when the scene is supposed to be in heaven, where our Lord is no longer a child. For example, in the church of Gesu e Maria, in the Corso at Rome, where sermons are preached in English for the conversion of the English, there are no less than three altar-pieces, pictures larger than life, representing the virgin Mary with the infant Jesus *in heaven*.‡ Middleton informed the world long ago, that the Pantheon, the noblest heathen temple that yet remains, bore an inscription to this effect: that having been impiously dedicated of old by Agrippa to Jove and all the gods, it was piously re-consecrated by pope Boniface IV. to the blessed Virgin and all the saints. The inscription, we believe, still remains.

* Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 379.

† Ibid. p. 388.

‡ *Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome*. By the Rev. M. H. Seymour, M.A. p. 84. London, 1850.

The invariable characteristic of idolatry has always been, that it supposes the god to be more powerful or more propitious in some localities than in others. This feature has never been wanting in the history of the demonolatry of Popery. Let one example suffice at present:—"In the church S. Maria della Pace, there is over one of the altars the following inscription: '*Ogni messa celebrata in quest' altare libera un animo dal purgatorio*'—'Every mass celebrated at this altar frees a soul from purgatory:' thus making the efficacy of the mass to lie, not in the mass itself, but in the altar at which it is offered."*

Since the charge of idolatry is the weightiest that can be preferred against a human being, it is very undesirable that it should rest upon evidence less than the most ample and conclusive. The church of Rome has, in her infatuation, left no lack of testimony against herself, as the following extracts will serve to illustrate and confirm. The first gives an account of the adoration of the cross, as habitually performed by his holiness the pope, by all the cardinals, and the whole court of Rome, on Good Fridays:—

"A cross made of wood stands upon the altar in the Sistine Chapel. It is enveloped in a black veil. The deacon hands it to the officiating cardinal. He, standing with his back to the altar and his face to the people, holds the cross before the eyes of the congregation. Then, loosening the black veil which envelopes it, he uncovers one arm

* Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 388.

of the cross, pauses, holds it conspicuously before the congregation, and exclaims with a loud voice, 'Behold the wood of the cross!' And the response bursts from the choir, 'Come, let us adore it!' And immediately the pope, the cardinals, and all present, kneel and adore it, and then resume their seats. Again the officiating cardinal uncovers the second arm of the cross, pauses, exclaims as before, 'Behold the wood of the cross!' and the response again bursts from the choir, 'Come, let us adore it!' and, as before, the pope, the cardinals, and all present, kneel and adore it, and then resume their seats. Again the officiating cardinal uncovers the whole cross, pauses, and exclaims as before, 'Behold the wood of the cross!' and the response again bursts from the choir, 'Come, let us adore it!' and immediately the pope, the cardinals, and all present, kneel and adore it a third time. All this was painful enough to me, yet it proved only the beginning of sorrows. There was a solemnity, a silence, a stillness in all, which, combined with the appearance of the chapel, made it very impressive, and this very impressiveness it was that made all so painful. The cardinal with his assistants left the altar, and placed the cross on a cushion, on the floor of the chapel, a few paces from the steps of the altar, and retired. And here the ceremony commenced indeed. Two or three cardinals approached the pope—they stripped off his splendid robes, they removed his glittering mitre, they took off his embroidered shoes, they laid aside his spangled gloves, till he stood before his throne without

one emblem of his royal or papal office. There stood the old man, bareheaded and barefooted, and stripped till he seemed to retain little else than a loose white dressing-gown, the dress of a monk of Camaldoli. There he stood, not alone, as if the act were a voluntary humiliation, but in the hands of the cardinals, who, intending to help and uphold him, seemed to be his guards to force and compel him. Then the old man, no longer looking like a pope, descended from the throne, and seemed like one led away to be punished or to do penance. Having conducted the pope to the end of the chapel, they turned and faced the cross, which lay on the floor, near the step of the altar. There they made him kneel and adore it. They raised him, and conducting him some two or three paces nearer, they made him kneel a second time and adore the cross. Then again they raised him, and leading him nearer still, they again, the third time, made him kneel and adore the cross. Here, at the cross, they raised him, and then again he knelt, then rose again, then knelt again. Prostrate before it, on knees and hands, he kissed it, and, according to custom, left a hundred scudi of gold, as an offering, beside it. He was afterwards conducted to his throne, and robed, whilst the most exquisite music from the choir accompanied the whole ceremony. When this is completed by the pope, the same act is performed by each of the cardinals, all without shoes, adoring and kissing the cross. These are followed by the bishops, heads of orders, etc., all adoring it in like manner, and all making it an

offering of money. The deacons then spread the cloth on the altar, light the candles, and reverently place the cross, no longer on the floor, but on the altar, amidst the candlesticks. Such is 'the adoration of the cross,' an act of worship that moved me intensely, infinitely more than anything I had witnessed at Rome. It was an act the most solemn and impressive, that bore every characteristic of idolatry."*

We shall add only another illustration. There is a statue or image of St. Peter placed in the church named after that apostle, in one of the most prominent positions. It is elevated on a bold marble pedestal; it is formed of bronze, and is a sitting figure: the face is severe and stern; the right hand is lifted as if in the act of blessing—with the two fore-fingers and thumb according to the papal form; the left hand holds two great keys. It is believed by many, that it was originally the image of Jupiter, with the thunderbolt removed, and the keys substituted in their place. "We have witnessed," says the traveller last quoted, "the pope himself, the cardinals, the archbishops, the bishops, priests, monks, and friars, and all classes of ecclesiastical persons, bow and worship and kiss it. We have also witnessed kings, queens, princes, dukes, nobles, and all ranks and orders of society, bow and worship before it and kiss it. It is the universal practice of the Romans. On one occasion, we went to St. Peter's to witness the pope himself, as the head of the church, paying worship,

* Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, pp. 299—301. 1849.

or homage, or reverence, under whatever name men delight to call it, to this image of bronze. He came, attended in full state by the cardinals and all his court. He was surrounded by his guards, which kept sufficient space around the image. He approached reverently, while a chamberlain or other officer carefully wiped with a handkerchief the toe of the image. The pope bowed lowly before it, till his head was lower than the projecting foot of the image. He then raised his head very gently, till it touched the sole of the foot. In this position, with the foot of the image on his head, he made his reverence, moving his lips as if in prayer; remaining for a short time thus humbled under a semblance of prayer, he concluded by changing the position, kissing the great toe of the image; then touching it with his forehead, he passed away to kneel before the high altar. All the cardinals followed, bowing to the image, and kissing its foot. All the archbishops and bishops, all the priests and other officials of the court, followed this example, and passed on in like manner. This scene, so formal and so public, set at rest all doubts as to the sanction of the church of Rome to this idolatry. It was the act, not of a simple, ignorant, or superstitious populace, giving way to feeling, against the better teaching of their priesthood; but it was the formal and public act of the head of the church of Rome, accompanied by all its authorities."*

Behold, the pretended vicar of the Lord Jesus is himself a gross and base idolater! The word of

* Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 453.

the living God is neither silent nor ambiguous:—"They that make idols are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them," Psa. cxv. 8. Oh for another Elijah to lift up his voice in Rome, ay, and in Westminster too! "If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him," 1 Kings xviii. 21.

DECEPTION.

"With all deceivableness of unrighteousness." 2 *Thess.* ii. 10.

This feature of Popery is manifested in a variety of ways. The coming of "that Wicked" or lawless one, is "after the working of Satan," or the devil, who is "a liar, and the father of it." Rome's assumed infallibility is a gigantic lie; her priestly office, and her sacrifice of the mass, are the most impious falsehoods that hell can invent. Her five additional sacraments are five undisguised and shameless forgeries.

The *confessional* is a congeries of lies, and consequently claims some notice here. The priestly confessor, in pretending to occupy God's place, plainly stands in a false position; besides, he deceives his victim, by promising pardon which he cannot bestow; and he frequently deceives the civil authorities of the land in which he dwells, by concealing information which he ought to communicate, in order to prevent robbery, bloodshed, and other outrages. By obtaining in the confessional

previous knowledge, which he is bound by oath not to divulge, the priest becomes a secret accomplice in many crimes. On these points we do not dwell; but we cannot leave the subject of auricular confession without remarking, that the mind of the confessing priest has been sometimes compared to the common sewer of his parish. It would indeed be well if he discharged so valuable and wholesome a function. But the ghostly father's mind is a sewer constantly choked, throwing back its filth and malaria upon a diseased and dying community.

Dispensations form another branch of this prolific theme. No Romanist questions that in the church, that is, in the priesthood generally, but especially in the pope, there resides an authority able to dispense with the obligation of promises and oaths. It is laid down in the canon law, that "an oath taken contrary to ecclesiastical utility is not valid." This immoral dogma has been sanctioned by the third Lateran Council, which has decreed: "Those are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are taken contrary to ecclesiastical utility and the institutions of the fathers." *

We do not charge the church of Rome with teaching, as is sometimes represented, that faith is not to be kept with heretics; but we charge on the priesthood of Rome the guilt of inculcating and practising the maxim, that faith is *not always* to be kept with heretics; that there are occasions when solemn oaths may be broken, and the pope

* See Appendix V.

and the priest have power to determine when these occasions arise. The most notable example of such perfidy is found in the case of John Huss, the Bohemian reformer. This case does not stand alone; it is rather to be regarded as the highest climax of the church's iniquity, for it was common, up to the time of the Reformation, for the popes to sell dispensations for the transgression of all laws, human and Divine. The most concise and complete statement of the treatment of Huss with which we have met is the following, from the pen of Robert Hall:—"When John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer, was arrested, cast into prison, and publicly burned alive at Constance, in spite of a 'safe-conduct' given him by the Emperor Sigismund—merely because he refused to belie his conscience by abjuring his pretended heresy—all was executed under the eyes and by the express authority of the council, who solemnly decreed that the safe-conduct of the emperor ought to be considered as no impediment to the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but, notwithstanding, that it was perfectly competent for the ecclesiastical judge to take cognizance of his errors, and to punish them agreeably to the dictates of justice, although he presented himself before them in dependence upon that protection, but for which he would have declined appearing. Nor were they satisfied with this impious decision alone. Because murmurs were heard, on account of the violation of a legal protection, they had the audacity to add, that, since the said John Huss had, by impugning the

orthodox faith, forfeited every privilege, and since no promise or faith was binding, either by human or Divine right, in prejudice of the Catholic faith, the said emperor had done as became his royal majesty in violating his safe-conduct; and that whoever, of any rank or sex, dares to impugn the justice of the holy council, or of his majesty, in relation to their proceedings with John Huss, shall be punished without hope of pardon, as a favourer of heretical pravity, and guilty of the crime of high treason."

Let no one imagine that this infamous maxim is an antiquated notion. It was virtually sanctioned by the Council of Trent, which offered a safe-conduct to the Protestants who might be present in that assembly, and, in doing so, ought in consistency to have rescinded the decree of the Council of Constance in favour of the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics; but, instead of acting this manly and Christian part, satisfied themselves with suspending it "for that occasion."* In 1813, Napoleon signed a concordat with Pius VII., which Pius soon took occasion to repudiate. Peter Dens, in the Maynooth text-book now in use, attempts to explain and defend this doctrine of the church.† The substance of his argument is this: When the church dispenses with an oath, that dispensation interposes with Divine authority, to annihilate its existence and obligation as an oath; after a dis-

* *Conc. Trid.* Sess. xv.—"Salvus conductus datus Protestantibus."

† See Appendix X.

pensation, an oath cannot be violated, for it has ceased to be. Here is a marvellous transmutation! The most solemn obligation under which a man may bring himself by word or writing, if it pass under the wand of a priestly dispensation, ceases to be a moral obligation; its essence is extracted, and the residuum is an empty sound, or a piece of waste paper.

This point receives ample and appalling illustration in the proceedings and principles of the Jesuits, as they have ever been, and still are, manifested in almost every land where Popery has planted her footstep.

To mention the *pious frauds* and *lying wonders* of the church of Rome, is to open an inexhaustible mine of investigation. False miracles have frequently been employed in argument, and not without much success, in justifying the idolatry, and sustaining the assumed authority, of the papacy. The more skilful advocates of Rome, however, rest the defence of her pious frauds and lying wonders, not upon their own merits, but upon the approbation of the church; while, in point of fact, it was the idolatrous tendencies and practices of the people that gave birth to the whole tribe of miraculous legends. A proneness to idolatrous worship has ever been the strongest stimulus to prosecute the trade of pretended miracles; while the gains and influence thence accruing to the priesthood, have established and perpetuated the whole circle of abominable impostures.

The most profitable method of contemplating

this part of our subject is to connect, as much as possible, the most recent with the most ancient manifestations of the lying spirit. There is now to be seen in the palace of the Vatican a picture which represents the story of St. Anthony. This well-known saint, in the simplicity of his mind, put a literal interpretation upon the words of our Lord, by which he commissioned the apostles to "preach the gospel to every creature." Feeling himself, therefore, under an obligation to preach to the fishes of the sea, seeing that they are the creatures of God as truly as the intelligent inhabitants of the earth, Anthony took his station by the sea-shore, and commenced preaching to the fishes. The picture in the Vatican represents the monk as thus employed, with uplifted hands, while multitudes of fish are to be seen putting their heads out of the water, and frisking their tails, to manifest their approbation of the preacher's words. The inscription attached to the picture certifies the truth of the miracle; and several figures are represented in the background as lost in amazement at the wondrous prodigy.

This Anthony was a well-known individual, who was born A.D. 251, and succeeded in forming into a regular body the ascetics, who, at that early period, had multiplied in great numbers. Athanasius, whose decease occurred A.D. 373, has given to the world a memoir, covering fifty-four folio pages, of this "patriarch of monks." Nazianzen, Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom are all loud in his praises. He was called "the perfectly holy man,"

"the angel upon earth," "the pattern of the angelic philosophy," "the faultless disciple of Christ." In all the writings of the fathers, there does not seem to be a doubt breathed as to the genuineness of Anthony's piety, which, we thus perceive, has been regarded by the generations of fifteen centuries as an example of more than human sanctity. "Let the candid and honest reader," says the author of *Ancient Christianity*, "take the pains to peruse for himself every sentence concerning this saint which antiquity has handed down to us, and then acknowledge that we may find far more of evangelic doctrine, a better-digested theology, and a better temper, as well as much less of extravagance and folly, in the Romish saints of the middle and later ages, than in St. Anthony, the pattern saint of the Nicene age."*

The miracles alleged to be wrought by St. Anthony and other ascetics, from the fourth century downwards, were such as these:—"In many instances, by the application of the relics of a martyr, or by the invocation of their names, or by the sign of the cross, or by other equally efficacious and Scriptural means, the dead stood erect; and sometimes described to the amazed crowd the secrets of the invisible world; sometimes they decided a debate in favour of orthodoxy; and in one such instance, a holy man sailing up the Nile with a party of his friends and opponents, to a spot where the ancient sepulchral caverns abut upon the river, he called forth one who, according to his own account

* Vol. ii. p. 98.

had lived in the remotest times of Egyptian history. This awful arbitrator of theological differences, after having given his decisive suffrage in favour of Catholic principles, obediently returned to his mummy or chrysalis state, at the word of the saint, who bade him rest till the general resurrection."* As special examples of our general assertion, we refer to the miracles ascribed to the relics of the martyrs of Milan, to those said to have been performed by the relics of Stephen, the protomartyr, and to those connected with the invention of the cross, a piece of which is still exhibited in St. Peter's at Rome.

As to the modern aspect of Rome's pretended miracles, we might refer the reader to every record of travels pursued in popish countries, and more especially to the authorized breviary of the church. "The Glories of Mary," by Liguori, and similar works of devotion, are filled with miraculous legends. In the breviary, for example, under date May 27, we have an account of the following semi-miracle. His holiness the pope, being on a journey to Corinth, and in want of a quiet and comfortable horse, borrowed one which the lady of a certain nobleman used to ride. The animal carried the pope comfortably enough, and when the journey was over, was returned to his mistress. But in vain did she attempt to enjoy the accustomed services of her favourite: the horse had become fierce, and gave the lady many an unseemly fall; "as if," says the authorized record, "feeling indignant at

* *Ancient Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 103.

having to carry a woman, since the vicar of Christ had been on his back."* In Roman Catholic countries, miracle-working relics and pictures are beyond enumeration. Among the latter may be specified the Madonna by St. Luke, at Bologna. "There are fifty instances," says Seymour, "given wherein this miraculous image was resorted to in order to obtain miraculous assistance in time of need. And these instances run through a period of some centuries, concluding with one so late as the year 1834; thus showing that even within the last few years the priestcraft of the priesthood, and the superstition of the people, are quite as rife and rampant as ever. And all these details have been published with the signature of the inquisitor-general, in the year 1840."†

* "Tamquam indignaretur mulierem recipere, ex quo sedisset in eo Jesu Christi vicarius."—*Breviarium Romanum*. Mechliniæ, 1848.

† The wonder-working *relics* of the church of Rome are literally without number. Against them four distinct and serious charges may be substantiated:—1. The miracles which they are reported to perform are all pious frauds. 2. The articles produced as relics are generally pure inventions. 3. The most shameful falsehoods are practised upon the public, inasmuch as several localities are often found boasting of the possession of the same relic. (See a most amusing and conclusive tract, from the pen of Calvin, entitled, *The Advantages which Christendom might derive from an Inventory of Relics.*) 4. The relics are often contemptible, indelicate, and disgusting—as the teeth, arms, knees, thighs, etc., of saints; the chemise of the blessed virgin Mary; the sponge in which the blood of martyrs was collected; a phial full of our Saviour's blood; another full of the milk of Mary, etc. Even though such things were *authentic* relics, it would be more Scriptural to bury them (2 Kings xxiii. 18) than to preserve and adore them. "The worms of the grave, which prey on the flesh of the dead,

If the legendary miracles of the ages of mediæval darkness be not, as authentic history assures us, a whit more ridiculous or extravagant than those of the Catholic church of the fourth century, and those of the popish church of the nineteenth century, it is not only reasonable to classify them together, but by doing so we shall reap several advantages. The evidence of the truth of all those alleged miracles, and their moral characteristics, are substantially the same. If, then, those of one age or country be received as genuine, the rest must also be received; and on the other hand, if we reject any portion of them, we are bound in consistency to reject the whole. When one of two contending parties claims to exercise miraculous powers, this claim brings the dispute to an issue, and forces all men to come to a decision. The real possession of miraculous power proves a Divine commission; the false assumption of miraculous power is conclusive proof of the most guilty apostasy. There will, therefore, ultimately be only two parties in the popish controversy;—those who totally reject the lying wonders of the last fifteen hundred years, and retain the New Testament and its authenticated miracles; and those who, receiving implicitly all the legends of the past, continue in the communion of the so-called united and infallible church. Hence we perceive how unstable is the position occupied by the modern Tractarians,

and eke out a hard existence from the rottenness of the tomb, are rivalled only by the monks and friars of Rome, who feed and fatten on the wealth extracted from the bones of the dead."

who, rejecting the impious tales of the middle ages, hold up to our imitation the assumed perfection of the Nicene church. Those who would follow in every respect the footsteps of the saints of the fourth and fifth centuries, must adopt the idolatry and lying wonders which characterized that age. In doing so they become apostates from the faith; they virtually dishonour and nullify the real manifestations of Divine power—the signs which God has wrought to demonstrate his love to mankind, and to guide us in the way of salvation; and they can find no resting-place, as too many recent instances testify, but in the deep and debasing superstitions, or in the lofty and impious presumptions, of matured Popery.

Some of the chief reasons for rejecting the alleged miracles of Popery and the Nicene church are these: The narrations themselves, in their style and circumstances, manifest the strongest characteristics of fraud and folly; their defence is entirely abandoned by many Roman Catholic writers, and by a still greater number they are regarded as of an inferior kind when compared with the miracles of the New Testament; there is evidence to prove that these alleged miracles were not received by many judicious Christians at the time they are said to have taken place: the very writers who report these pretended miracles are found on other occasions admitting that miracles had long ceased in the church; they have all taken place manifestly and directly to subserve party and political purposes, to increase the influence

and fill the coffers of the clergy, by whom they are always reported; they have generally been wrought in support of opinions and customs directly opposed to the doctrines and duties inculcated in the word of God; they have been a chief means of supporting and perpetuating idolatrous worship; and they are clearly foretold by inspired writers as signs of the great Apostasy. The miracles wrought by Jesus Christ and his apostles are remarkably different in their circumstances, their style, and the varied proofs of their genuineness. They were performed before opponents, whose interests and inclinations naturally led them to make the strictest investigations. They were wrought, not by a prevailing party possessed of all the instruments and resources necessary to carry through a scheme of imposture, but by persons moving in the lowest and least influential sphere of society. Their reality was not at the time questioned by the enemies of Christianity; but attempts were made to account for them on the principle of magical influence. No private interests, no party purposes, were promoted by the Christian miracles. The performers lost much, and gained nothing, personally, by their achievements. The avowed and only conceivable object of the New Testament miracles was to prove the authenticity of a heavenly message, to establish on the ground of incontrovertible facts the Divine authority of a new dispensation.

PERSECUTION.

"Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."—ROMANS xiii. 10.

To adduce formal proof that Popery is a system which has avowed and practised persecuting principles in religion, seems to be almost superfluous. We know of none of her standard writings in which the persecution of heretics is not enjoined. There is not a country into which she has found an entrance which has not experienced, in the persons of some of its inhabitants, the violence of sacerdotal tyranny. No generation has been numbered with its fathers till some of its best blood has been shed at the altar of the Roman Moloch. Though intolerance, like other evils, be not peculiar to Popery, it is to be observed, that its development in the papacy has been altogether unparalleled. This extraordinary development may be seen, not only in the extent to which it has been carried, but in the manner in which it has been defended. *Other* churches have tasted the bewitching cup of blood; *she* has drunk of its contents to intoxication. *They* have seized the sword of persecution in fits of pride or irritation; *she* has never relaxed her grasp, and has taught her children the art of wielding it. *They* have renounced the right to persecute, and been ashamed of the unrighteous cruelties of their an-testors; *she* still glories in all the atrocities of the past, and manifests a disposition, whenever she may have the power, to renew them.

The persecutions of which Popery has been the author and the agent, are *more numerous and more*

tragical than those ever perpetrated by any other party. If we examine the archives of past time, and become acquainted with the condition of the nations of the world, we shall invariably find, travel where we may,—among the peaceful villages of remote India, east or west; among the oppressed serfs of feudal states; or among the freemen of commercial cities,—that the church of Rome has everywhere left the indelible marks of her never-to-be-mistaken footstep; her robes have always been dripping with human gore. Against no school in philosophy, against no political dynasty, against no other sect in religion, against no other party whatsoever, can the same heavy and painful charge be, with any show of justice, brought forward. When we open the pages of revelation, and peruse their contents, we find a certain power, and only one such, described, under the prophetic symbol of a woman, "*drunken* with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," Rev. xvii. 6. Let those who can, doubt the identity of these two parties.

Popery has reduced the practice of persecution to an art. We refer to the history of the Inquisition. It were out of place here to attempt a sketch of this partially unknown, because purposely concealed, institution, or labour to describe its indescribable horrors. Not one of its victims has been liberated till he took a solemn oath never to reveal what he had witnessed within its walls. Suspicion of guilt has been always regarded as a sufficient ground to justify imprisonment. Self-accusation, whether elicited by delusive promises or extorted

by force, is ample evidence to warrant a verdict of "guilty." The accused is never confronted with his accusers; and the confession of a sufferer, maddened by agonizing torture, becomes a charge against his dearest friends. The man who confesses guilt escapes the stake, but is relieved of all his property. Hence, confession is urgently pressed upon every prisoner; for in sparing his life, Rome's mercy is displayed; while in seizing the wealth of a self-convicted criminal, her justice cannot be impeached. Accordingly, multitudes have confessed offences which they never committed nor meditated. We have no desire to form too intimate acquaintance with the loathsome cells of the holy office, with the varied, ingenious, and fiendish instruments of its torture, or with the insanity produced by protracted solitary confinement. As an example of the smooth and charitable language in which Popery can sanction her most atrocious proceedings, we insert the conclusion of the sentence by which heretics are condemned to the stake:—"That the mercy of the holy office being prevented by their relapse or contumacy, and being indispensably obliged to punish them according to the rigour of the law, it gave them up to the secular power and civil justice, *which it nevertheless entreated to regard with mercy and clemency these miserable creatures;* and if they were liable to capital punishment, that it should be inflicted without effusion of blood."* The magistrate, far from having a discretionary power, as seems to be here implied, is by the canon

* See Dellon's *Inquisition at Goa.* London, 1815.

law esteemed and treated as a heretic, if he decline to execute the sentence of the Inquisition.

Popery has uniformly claimed the right, and asserted her obligation, to persecute heretics. These pretensions have been kept in abeyance only when the priesthood have been in depressed circumstances, and unable to carry them out with practical effect. The direct proof of these statements can be found of course only in the numerous pages of history, and in the authorized standards of the church. As an illustration from the latter, we refer to the persecuting clause in the episcopal oath, which is as follows: "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord (the pope), or his foresaid successors, I will, to my power, persecute and oppose."* There is no ambiguity in this language, and it is sworn to by every bishop (with an exception to be presently noticed) in the Romish church. As another manifestation of the same intolerant spirit, we find in a folio edition of the Douay Bible, published some time ago in Manchester, the following note on Deut. xvii. 8—13, setting forth the authorized interpretation of the passage—"Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the church guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal all controversies relating to the law, and punishing with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions. *And surely he has not done less for the church guides of the New Testament.*"†

* See Appendix Y.

† Fletcher's *Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion*, p. 396. London, 1818.

As an illustration of actual persecution, we might notice at length, did our limits permit, the case of the Huguenots, whose slaughter commenced on St. Bartholomew's day, in the year 1572, and was continued for seven days in Paris, and for two months in the provinces of France. During this time, fifty thousand persons were put to a cruel death. That this tragedy is to be charged as a crime against the papacy, cannot be doubted; among other proofs, may be mentioned the fact, that the tidings of its accomplishment were received in Rome with acclamations of triumph, and a medal was struck to commemorate the dread calamity. Protestants felt that it was a blow aimed at their cause, for the messenger who announced the tidings in England was received by queen Elizabeth and her court in deep mourning. Or we might refer to the earlier case of the Albigenses, to exterminate whom the Inquisition was originated; and against whom a crusade was preached, which summoned to arms thirty thousand men. This storm of persecution continued for half a century, and swept from the earth no fewer than a million lives. Popery cannot escape from the responsibility of this enormity. Though there were no other evidence, the preaching of the crusade under papal authority is sufficient to bring home the charge.

"Oh, weep for the martyrs! oh, weep for the hour
When the children of darkness and evil had power;
When crusaders from Rome triumphantly trod
On the heroes that bled for their rights and their God.

Oh, weep for the martyrs; oh, weep for the slain,
Who for faith and for freedom lay slaughtered in vain.
Oh, weep for the living, who lingered to bear
The renegade's shame, or the exile's despair."

The tears of sympathy will begin to dry up when we reflect, that the faithful sufferers, having passed through great tribulation, are now before the throne of God, serving him "day and night in his temple," and that the rage of their heartless murderers only served to "chase them up to heaven."

Another reflection will fill us with gratitude and confidence. The calm and happy deaths of the martyred saints are at once the surest proof of the truth of Christianity, and the best pledge of its ultimate triumph. "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy;" how much more they that sow in blood! "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." "Sire," said Beza to the king of France, "it does indeed belong to the church of God to *suffer* blows, rather than *inflict* them, but let it be remembered that the church is an anvil which has worn out many a hammer."

Let us now inquire, *What is the present state of Romanism as to persecuting principles.*

First, we would recall attention to *the clause in the oath taken by bishops at their consecration*, which has been already quoted. This clause, it is said, is omitted in the consecration of bishops who are to discharge their functions in this Protestant land. A question might be raised as to the correctness of this assertion; as to whether or not, in every such instance, the omission be really made.

But, waiving entirely this consideration, we proceed to observe that it seems a matter of indifference, so far as the character of the church of Rome is concerned, whether the bishops of that church in Great Britain are bound by the persecuting clause or not. If we give full credit to the statement that they are not, we thereby attain additional certainty in the shape of a new acknowledgment, that their brethren in other countries *are bound* by its intolerant terms. Hence we cannot but infer that it is not used in this land, because it cannot now be here enforced, and because its discontinuance in these circumstances may tend to allay suspicion, and to disarm hostility. How can we avoid this inference, when we know that in other lands it is used, and the cruelties which it breathes are realized in actual penalties? The admission which Romanists make in this matter is a most serious blunder: they grant that their bishops throughout the world are sworn both to believe the extravagance, and practise the enormities, of religious persecution; from which oath the bishops appointed to serve in this country are alone exempted. This single admission is enough to destroy the charm of Rome's boasted unity and infallibility, and to brand upon her indelibly the charge of persecution. In this charge are included not only the cruelty of inflicting temporal punishments upon men, for holding religious opinions different from hers; but the guilt of avowing the resolution, and defending the propriety of so acting. Those, therefore, who, overlooking such obvious facts and considerations, believe that Popery abstains from

asserting her intolerant maxims in this country at the present time in sincerity and good faith, and not simply because it is reckoned inexpedient to do so, manifest no part of the prudence of the Christian, nor of the spirit of the patriot, nor of the sagacity of the statesman.

Does the church of Rome *still* persecute? There is very much evidence to prove that she does. Reference might be made to the case of Dr. Kalley, of Madeira, or to the injustice done to the queen of Tahiti, or to the recent proceedings of the Inquisition in the case of Dr. Achilli. As the details of these events are easily accessible, it is unnecessary to dwell upon them here.

In the countries of Europe which are under papal influence, *the native inhabitants do not enjoy liberty of conscience.* It is reported on good evidence,* regarding Charles Albert, king of Sardinia, that he declared, on one occasion, that he would sooner lay his head on the block, than allow his subjects to worship God otherwise than according to the rites of the Roman Catholic church. Accordingly, Sir C. E. Eardley was recently expelled from Genoa by the Sardinian government, for *giving away* a single copy of *the Roman Catholic edition of the Bible*, which was designated by that government an "anti-religious book." Sardinia, thus intolerant to her own children, has been called to suffer for not being submissive enough to the authority of the supreme pontiff. Denying personal liberty to her subjects, she has failed to attain national freedom. In her

* Sir C. E. Eardley, in a *Letter*, *dated Torquay*, Nov. 28, 1850.

efforts to take all civil suits from the jurisdiction of the Romish bishops, and bring them under the cognizance of the civil courts, and to subject ecclesiastical persons to the authority of the criminal tribunals of the country, she has been unsuccessful. Count Santa Rosa, who took a leading part in these efforts, exposed himself, on that account, to the displeasure of the priesthood, and died "unhousel'd, unanointed, and unanel'd."*

Since these events occurred, the kingdom of Sardinia has taken her place among the free and independent countries of Europe. But she occupies a position of special hazard, being encompassed by spiritual and political despotisms, and has to maintain a perpetual struggle with the emissaries of the Roman pontiff.

The treatment which Protestants meet with in papal states is highly illiberal. An English sculptor, Mr. Hely, was last year expelled from the Roman

* A few years ago a dispute arose between the ecclesiastics and laymen of Valais, a Swiss canton, similar to that between the papal hierarchy and the Sardinian government, already noticed. The subject of disagreement was threefold; namely, the exemption of ecclesiastics from the jurisdiction of the civil tribunals—the excessive powers of the conventual clergy—and the depressed state of education. This dispute between priests and people having run high, the latter rose against the former, a collision took place at Martigny, and the peasantry, who were without arms, being waylaid by the monks, were cruelly slaughtered. The most painful part of the story remains to be told. The monks refused the last rites of the church to their dying countrymen and dying fellow-Christians, while they believed that the salvation of their souls throughout eternity depended on the observance of these rites. "A minister of Christ would have tried to save them; a minister of Satan would have tried to damn them. The monks of the Valais adopted the latter course."—Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 27.

States, and his solitary English Bible taken from him. The police told him that the pope was determined to destroy Bibles "wherever and however found."* While England allows members of the church of Rome, whether natives or foreigners, the most ample toleration within her territory, both to practise the rites of their religion, and to use all the efforts of logic and oratory to make converts; and while the advocates of the papacy are appealing to the principles of British liberty in tones of the highest confidence, and even attempting to stretch these principles to an undue length, what is the state of matters at Rome? Far from allowing a single Protestant missionary to settle within her boundary, she will not even grant permission to English residents to worship God according to their conscience within the walls of the city.†

If a party like the church of Rome, which claims to be infallible, be found guilty of *only one* act of persecution, she is thereby thrown upon the horns of a dilemma, each of which must prove equally

* Sir C. E. Eardley, in a *Letter, dated Torquay*, Nov. 28, 1850.

† The chaplain of the English congregation in Rome thus describes their condition some years ago:—"In the year 1826, the English congregation migrated to a granary outside the Flaminian gate. In the upper part of this huge building, a space large enough for a congregation was hired. The rats and mice ran races over the canvas above the heads of the worshippers; the pigs in great numbers squealed in concert in the story below; and sometimes the donkeys, laden with sacks of corn, disputed the common staircase with the congregation. On one occasion, the competition was more serious. The first story of the building was hired for a menagerie, and on a Sunday morning we found the wild beasts in previous possession."—*Blackwood's Magazine*, Feb. 1851.

unpleasant. If it can be shown that the Romish church has, on even one occasion, shed innocent blood, she must either defend persecution, or renounce infallibility. Some Romanists believe that infallibility resides in a council. Can any one of these assert that not one of their general councils has consigned a single heretic to the flames? Others believe that infallibility is lodged in St. Peter's chair. Can any one of this class attempt to prove that none of the triple-crowned prelates has sanctioned one case of imprisonment, torture, or death, as the penalty of religious error? Some Romanists are persuaded that infallibility is to be found in the consent of a council and a pope. Will any one of these be bold enough to maintain that that consent has never sealed the temporal doom of a contumacious heretic? To assert that the church of Rome has never in one solitary case deprived a human being of liberty, property, or life, for denying some of her religious doctrines, is gross ignorance or obvious disingenuousness If the church of Rome has sanctioned one such act of intolerance and cruelty, and be *infallible*, she must be regarded as the choice instrument of the demon of persecution, prepared now, as she has always been, to crush to the very utmost of her ability every opponent. If Popery be infallible, she is the patroness of persecution; if she be not the patroness of persecution, she is not infallible. Let her adherents choose for themselves which side of this alternative they please.

CHAPTER IX.

POPERY PREDICTED AND PORTRAYED BY THE PEN OF INSPIRATION.

THE facts of church history during the last fourteen or fifteen centuries are, in the estimation of Protestants, arrayed for the most part in dark and sombre colours. A review of the past forces them to the conclusion that the professing church of Christ has been, during the longer part of her duration, and through the larger portion of her extent, not true to her Lord, but in a state of rebellion and apostasy. In the view of Romanists, however, the picture assumes a very different outline, and appears embellished with bright colouring. According to their opinion, the visible church has, since its institution, been generally in a prosperous condition, maintaining fealty to her Lord, and preserved by him in purity and peace. Protestants believe that the unity of the Christian church on earth has been lamentably broken; Romanists that it has been gloriously preserved. The one affirm that a large proportion of the ministers of the professing church have been unworthy men, and that the rites of the church have been extensively abused and desecra-

ted; the other, that the ministry has been continued in regular and pure succession, and that the ritual has been duly and effectively administered. In the judgment of the one, the past is gloomy and sad; in the judgment of the other, it is smiling and joyous.

The question now arises, Is the Bible entirely silent upon the course of the Christian church in the world? If it be not, it is an important point of inquiry, *With which of the two preceding views do the prophetic intimations of the word of God harmonize?*

The parable of the sower, and that of the tares, as they are delivered by our Lord, and recorded in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew, seem unquestionably to have a reference to what was then future. Agreeably to the import of both parables, the good seed was extensively sown—the gospel was preached far and wide, by the apostles and their successors. In accordance with the first parable, we find, in the history of the past, that some, being like the wayside, have never believed the gospel; others, being like the stony places, after receiving the word with joy, have turned away from the faith; some, being like the thorns, have allowed their religious convictions to be stifled by the cares and pleasures of the world; and some, being like good soil, have brought forth fruit unto God. If this parable were intended by our Lord, as we think it must have been, to give the disciples some hints at least of the character of coming events; if in any sense it be an epitome of church history, it is obvious, since it is dark rather than bright,—setting forth what is discreditable to

the hearers and professors of the gospel, rather than what is the reverse,—that it is more consistent with the Protestant than with the popish theory of the past.

The parable of the tares seems still more explicit. According to the Romish view, comparatively few tares have been sown, and far fewer allowed to grow, in the Christian community. According to the Protestant view, the seeds of corruption were early and plentifully sown, as we have seen in the first part of this treatise; serious errors were generally connived at and supported; their growth was rapid, and their fruit abundant and poisonous. The Protestant theory acknowledges that the tares and the wheat have been growing together in the same field, in the same community. The popish theory rejects this distinguishing circumstance, while it has been the unceasing object of the church of Rome to extirpate and burn every tare, without waiting for the harvest.

Again, it may be asked, Does our Lord, in the various instructions which he gives to the disciples, prepare their minds for *inflicting*, or for *suffering* violence? The answer to this question, which the dullest reader of the New Testament cannot miss, is of itself sufficient to determine the controversy. The Romish church finds, indeed, in this scripture, "I am come to send fire on the earth," a warrant for exterminating heresy by fagot and flame. But how oblique is her vision, when for this one passage—which it may indeed be granted foretells persecution, but can never be tortured so as to sanction it—

there are so many calling upon the disciples to prepare for every varied trial! For many centuries the Christian soil of the world has been moistened with its children's blood; the cities of Christendom have been dishonoured by lurid flames consuming living men. Let the reader of the New Testament say, with his eye specially fixed upon our Lord's recorded discourses with his disciples, or Paul's valedictory address to the Ephesian elders, whether he should expect the true disciples of Jesus Christ among the oppressors or the oppressed—among the spiritual tyrants or their bleeding victims?

If the Protestant view of the church in bygone ages be correct, and harmonize with the prophetic indications of Scripture, we obtain not only an argument against the system of Popery, but new evidence in support of the truth of Christianity. Church history not only presents to us a series of painful facts, but at first sight seems to suggest some serious doubts. One is ready to suppose that the progress of Christianity, after our Lord's departure from the world, should have been uninterrupted and unmarred, like a Summer sun climbing the steep of heaven till he reach his noon-day splendour. This expectation seems to commend itself to the mind, when we reflect that the Author of Christianity is almighty, that his purpose in establishing Christianity is one of the purest and deepest benevolence, and that the objects of his compassion are sunk in the grossest ignorance and most painful wretchedness. When this expectation is found to be altogether erroneous; when the professing church, instead of shining more

and more unto the perfect day, is seen passing, century after century, into deeper and deeper darkness; grave doubts will begin to rise in many minds as to the Divine origin of the Christian religion. There is, at least, one obvious and effectual method of removing such doubts, and leading the mind to bow in humility and confidence before the inscrutable arrangement of Divine providence. If it shall appear that the coming of a great apostasy was foreseen by the Author of the New Testament, and that Christ's disciples are expressly warned to expect its appearance, then every devout mind will be constrained reverently to exclaim, God's thoughts are not our thoughts; and every ingenuous and inquiring mind will find, in the sad fulfilment of the solemn predictions, a new argument for the Divine institution of the gospel, "that bringeth salvation to all men."

The passages of prophetic Scripture which are generally regarded by Protestants as referring more immediately to Popery, are the following:—the seventh chapter of the book of Daniel, the greater part of the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, the first portion of the fourth chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, a portion of the second chapter of the First Epistle of John, and the thirteenth and seventeenth chapters of the book of Revelation. Leaving the prophecies of Daniel and John, as opening too wide a field for our present limits, we solicit brief attention to those of Paul.

1 Tim. iv. 1—3.

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits,

and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron: forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth."

The introductory words of this prophecy, "the Spirit speaketh expressly," seem to be intended to awaken special attention to the prediction, and to stimulate to immediate watchfulness, as if the coming evil were not far off, but nigh at hand.

A period is next specified, "in the latter times." This evidently means in the times subsequent to the apostles' ministry—*during* the Christian dispensation, and not *at the end* of it.

By the use of the word "some," the apostle seems to imply, that the evil would originate with *one* class, while we are plainly taught elsewhere, that it would spread through the whole Christian community. If it be asked what class were the more direct originators of the great Apostasy, the burden of this prophecy unites with the numerous and striking facts of history in pointing to the ascetics.

The expression, "shall depart from the faith," might be rendered, shall apostatize from the faith. Apostasy is not every error, or every heresy; it is a falling away in what is primary and essential. The very essence of Christian worship is to adore the one true God, through the one true Mediator, Christ Jesus. To worship any other god, or to trust in any other mediator, is rebellion and apostasy against God and against Christ. Such an apostasy has prevailed, as we have seen, in the

nominal Christian church, during the lapse of many centuries.

The special nature of this falling away is next described in these words: "*giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.*" As it may be said that all error is suggested by evil spirits, there is likely to be some specific reference in the above statement. Now we know that Gnostic teachers, who were very numerous in early times, called themselves "spiritual ones" (πνευματικοι). These philosophers were first seduced, or led astray themselves, by their endless efforts to explore the spiritual world, and then their great influence rendered them seductive to others. By "doctrines of devils," or doctrines concerning demons, are no doubt pointed out the narrations or revelations which abound in all the records of asceticism, concerning supernal and invisible beings, including departed human spirits which are believed to haunt the earth. From the earliest to the latest times, and in every land, we find that tales of personal and visible conflicts with evil spirits, and a taste for demonological adventures, constitute the invariable characteristics of monkery. These, again, form an easy introduction to idolatry; and hence the temples, images, and altars which had been consecrated to Jupiter and the demons, have to a great extent been re-consecrated to the virgin Mary and the saints.

The chief means by which the apostasy should spread are now pointed out: "*speaking lies in hypocrisy,*" or, through the hypocrisy of liars.

Hypocrisy indicates the making or telling a falsehood for an interested purpose. In order to extend and establish their delusions, anchorites have been constantly prone to invent and rehearse fanciful stories and pretended wonders. Books have been forged under the names of the saints, legends of their lives have been invented, fabulous miracles have been multiplied, and saints have been canonized who never existed. The tendency of the whole of this hypocrisy has been to support and diffuse ascetic-idolatry, or saint-worship.

The great wickedness of the apostasy is next indicated: "*having their conscience seared with a hot iron.*" The habit of villany under the mask of piety indurates the conscience, as the application of a hot iron destroys the sensibility of the skin. Men in such a case feel no remorse for their lies and forgeries. It was a common sentiment even so early as the Nicene age, that he could not be a bishop who begot children while in office; that such were to be reckoned not husbands, but adulterers; and bishops were commanded to separate from their wives under pain of the highest ecclesiastical censures. This position was assumed by Christians, with the open Bible before them, where it is written, "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife;" and again, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." We have no stronger proof of the existence of a seared conscience, than is afforded by the conduct of a man who, professing to receive the Bible as the word of God, finds certain directions written

therein, and affirms or practises the reverse. There is scarcely room in matured Popery for the same cauterizing of the conscience as there was in the early church; for the light of the Bible was not put under a bushel in the latter, as it has been in the former.

The third verse explains more fully the nature of the apostasy. According to the doctrines of Popery and the Nicene church, Christianity is incomplete without asceticism. *Abstinence from marriage and from meats,* if it be not regarded as obligatory upon all men, *is regarded as an essential part of religion.* It is what all men should aim at; without it there may be salvation, but no perfection. The law of abstinence has always been absolute upon the professed ascetics; but often more in appearance than in reality. Marriage and meats have been forbidden in hypocrisy; that is, the enforcement of abstinence has been often a mere pretence. The fulfilment of this part of the prophecy in the system of Popery is notorious, and it had a very early commencement. In the fourth century, many, including some of the most eminent persons, put away their wives when promoted to bishoprics; and, besides the great number of unmarried persons who professed celibacy, hundreds deserted their wives and children, and buried themselves in monasteries.

On reviewing the whole passage which has now passed before us in detail, it cannot be denied that every statement finds an exact fulfilment in the church of Rome. At the same time, it is generally

felt that there is some little incongruity in supposing that the prophecy, as a whole, has its immediate reference to the papacy. On this supposition it is manifestly deficient. It finds, no doubt, a counterpart in Popery, but not a perfect or exact counterpart. The particulars enumerated belong to the Romish church, and are found there in the most conspicuous position; but it can scarcely be said that they form its distinguishing characteristics. It is difficult to see why, in a description of Popery, the prohibition of marriage and of meats should hold the most prominent place. A very ingenious attempt has been made to solve this difficulty, but it can scarcely be regarded as satisfactory. These have been selected, it has been said, as the characteristics of the church of Rome, "not because they are the worst, but the most palpable; not because they are the most impious, but the most easily recognised."

A better solution of this difficulty is found in supposing that the prophecy points more immediately to the condition of the Christian community in its transition state from the purity of primitive times to the ripened corruptions of Popery. Facts that are on record seem not only to justify this application of the prophecy, but in some degree to warrant the assertion, that it finds its literal and exact fulfilment here, and nowhere else. There may seem an objection to this application of the prophecy, in the word "forbid." But this word does not always imply prohibition by authority, and under penalties. And that marriage and

meats were forbidden in the fourth and fifth centuries, and that this prohibition was the characteristic feature of the age, cannot be doubted. They were forbidden absolutely to all professed ascetics, who formed a large proportion of the Christianized people; they were in a very obvious sense prohibited to all men, for every one felt that they could not be enjoyed without a loss of virtue; and marriage was virtually prohibited to the clergy by the force of usage and opinion. Moreover, this prophecy cannot refer to any of the Protestant churches; for the reformers, while desirous of adhering, as far as Scripture would allow, to opinions sanctioned by authority, have always been unanimous in totally rejecting ascetic notions and institutions.

We seem, therefore, to be shut up to the conclusion, that the *ascetic apostasy* predicted in the above passage, had its direct fulfilment in the corruptions of the Nicene church. This conclusion does not by any means lead us aside from our present argument. There is a moral and spiritual identity between the Popery of mediæval times—its parent, the church system of the Nicene age—and the latest progeny of the latter, the Tractarian school of England in the nineteenth century. In exposing and refuting the errors of one of these, we expose and refute the errors of all.

2 THESSALONIANS II. 1—12.

"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

In this passage of Holy Scripture we have the permanent characteristics of full-grown Popery, so distinctly stated as to leave no doubt that the system is here predicted and portrayed.

"A falling away," or apostasy, may mean one of two things: a falling away from the profession of the faith, or a falling away from the faith itself, while the profession is maintained. The latter is obviously its meaning here. The same word is frequently used in the Greek version of the Old Testament, to denote the idolatrous propensities and practices of

the Jewish church; so that it is fitly used here to denote those of the nominal Christian church.

The system is personified by the prophet, when he speaks of it as "the man of sin," "the son of perdition;" or we may suppose that these epithets characterize each individual, in a succession of men, who in turn occupied the place of supreme authority. It is altogether opposed to Scriptural usage, and the nature of the case, to suppose that only one person is here designated.

Antiochus was called "the man of sin" by the Jews (1 Macc. ii. 48 and 62), because he sought to alter their religion, and introduce the practice of idolatry by force and cruelty. The system of Popery may with propriety be personified and described as "the man of sin," because it is given up pre-eminently to all sin—for nowhere else can a man sin at so cheap a rate. Or the succession of Roman pontiffs may be predicted under this epithet; for every pope has resembled Antiochus in being a usurper and invader of the empire of the Son of God.

The appellation, "*the son of perdition*," is found in only one other passage of Scripture, John xvii. 12, where it is applied to Judas. Between the apostate apostle and the Roman pontiffs there are several obvious and striking resemblances. Both parties are, in profession, disciples of Christ; in office, governors of the church; in practice, traitors; and hence, in doom, *sons of perdition*. Judas sold his Master for a trifling sum; in like manner, everything sacred is sold at Rome: the popes make a market

of religion. Judas betrayed Christ with a kiss; so does the church of Rome. The crucifix is found everywhere in Popery: it is painted, carved, and gilded; it is placed in every temple, worn in every bosom, adored in every street; it is adorned with gold and precious stones, and takes precedence in every procession and assembly. Are not Romanists, then, the friends of the cross? Nay, verily. They "mind earthly things," and are therefore "the enemies of the cross of Christ," Phil. iii. 18. The pope is not the successor of Peter, but of Judas.

There is another epithet in Scripture descriptive of the great Apostasy, to which we shall allude for a moment. It is found in 1 John ii. 18: "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that anti-Christ shall come, even now are there many anti-Christs; whereby we know that it is the last time." The expression "anti-Christ" does not mean a false Christ—a pseudo-Christ—one who would entirely set aside the true Christ; it rather means a vice-Christ—a counter-Christ—one *in show for Christ, but in effect against Christ;* appearing as a substitute, but acting as an enemy. Such we have found to be the exact character of Popery.

We have the general character of Popery set forth in the expression, "who opposeth," or who is contrary to. Christ's kingdom is one of light, life, and love; Popery is a system of error, spiritual death, and all uncharitableness. Christ was the pattern of humility; the pope is the impersonation of pride. Christ said, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" (Luke xii. 14); the court

of the Votican would depose monarchs and divide kingdoms.

The more special features of the system are next enumerated. The first is stated in these words:—"*and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.*" "That which is called God," means the office of magistrate or king. (See Psa. lxxxii. 1—6, and John x. 34, 35.) "*That is worshipped,*" should rather be rendered, that which is august or illustrious. This was the distinguishing designation of the Roman emperors; as, for example, in Acts xxv. 21, where the same word in the original is rendered by our translators, Augustus. Al history proves that the popes have been always exalting themselves, sometimes successfully, and sometimes not, against magistrates and emperors.

The next characteristic stated, is in these words: "*so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God.*" "*The temple of God*" does not appear to refer to Jerusalem; for Jerusalem is never so described in any other passage of Scripture, and it was destroyed soon after the date of this Epistle. The external visible church is sometimes called the temple of God, as in 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; 2 Cor. vi. 16. Hence it is most probable that this is its import here. Whereas other princes are spoken of as *reigning*, the pope has generally been spoken of as *sitting*. Rome is his *cathedra*, or chair—his seat. The prophetic language anticipates this usage. The Roman pontiff may be said *to sit as God;* for he has usurped the place of Christ, the true and proper

Lord of the church, who is God incarnate. He has assumed the titles that belong to Christ. Innocent III. called himself the head of the church (compare Eph i. 22, 23); its chief pastor (compare 1 Pet. iv. 5); and its high priest (compare Heb. iii. 1, and iv. 14). He also called the church his spouse (compare Eph. v. 25, and Rev. xxi. 9). Moreover, the unlimited authority conferred on Christ has been claimed by many popes. It was maintained by Eugenius IV., in a council held at Florence in 1439, "that the court of God and the pope is the same as that of a bishop and his vicar, and therefore there is no higher tribunal upon earth."* The first of the thirty-five articles of faith found in the pocket of the Irish rebel priest, Murphy, who was killed at the battle of Arklow, was this: "We acknowledge that they (the pope, bishops, and priests) can make vice virtue, and virtue vice, according to their pleasure."† Such a confession is directly sanctioned by Bellarmine, who says, "If the pope should err by commanding vices or forbidding virtues, the church would be bound to believe that vices are good, and virtues evil."‡

We have the same feature of Popery described in other words; namely, "*showing himself that he is God.*" One of the articles for holding which Luther was condemned, was this:—"It is not in the power of the church or pope to make new articles of faith."§

* See Appendix Z.

† *Memoirs of the different Rebellions in Ireland.* By Sir Richard Musgrove. Appendix, p. 152. Dublin, 1801.

‡ See Appendix Z.

§ *Can. et Decret. Conc. Trid.*, p. 272, No. 27. Lipsiæ, 1846.

Anthony Pucci applied to Leo x. the prediction relative to the Messiah in Psalm lxxii. 11: "As if that prophetical saying ought again to be fulfilled in thee, the only true and legitimate vicar of Christ and of God, '*All the kings of the earth shall worship him: all nations shall serve him.*'"* Some of his deluded followers have called him, "Our Lord God the Pope;"† but we have not heard that such flatterers have been charged with heresy, and summoned before the holy office. We have already shown that similar pretensions are made in the present day. Indeed, the fact, to which we have called attention, that in the catechism of the Council of Trent, not the pope alone, but every priestly confessor is designated "the vicegerent of God," is enough of itself to fix upon the universal priesthood of the church of Rome the charge of blasphemy, and consequently to leave no doubt remaining as to where we must look for the fulfilment of this prophecy.

A note of the time when the apostasy might be expected is now introduced:—"*Ye know what withholdeth.*" It was the very general opinion of the early fathers—an opinion which has been continually gathering strength since then—that this refers to the Roman empire. There was no room

* See Appendix A A. *Conc. Later.* v. Sess. vii.

† This blasphemous appellation is given to the pope more than once in the articles of faith found on the person of the priest Murphy, and noticed *above*. The fourteenth is to this effect:—"We are bound to believe that Christ's vicar, the Lord God the Pope, can absolve all men (heretics excepted), and has given the like power to all his inferior clergy."

for the ecclesiastical chair till the removal of the imperial throne. This took place early in the seventh century. The Roman empire having been long ago destroyed, we are led to believe, either that this prophecy has not been accomplished at the time indicated, or that the Roman pontiff is "the man of sin," "the son of perdition." There is no other party to whom it can, with any show of reason, be applied.

When Popery is predicted as "*the mystery of iniquity*," we learn no more than that this system, which was before unknown, was foretold and revealed by the apostle.

Another descriptive epithet is given in the eighth verse: "*that Wicked*," or that lawless one. Some of the advocates of Popery have indulged in such statements as these: The pope is freed from all human *law;* God and the pope have their will for a *law.* When we find such statements, unauthorized though they may be, strictly correct in fact, and uncondemned by the head of the church, who is quick enough in detecting, and severe enough in punishing, all heresy; and when, moreover, there is a remarkable coincidence between them and the words of inspiration, they cannot but be regarded as signal-posts fitted to direct the traveller who is in search of truth. The special wickedness, however, which is here indicated, is, we think, idolatry. Idolatry is emphatically lawlessness; for it is not only the breach of the first commandment of the decalogue, but is the essence of all sin. Every transgression, as well as covetousness (Col. iii. 5),

might be called, and with equal propriety, idolatry. We have seen how idolatry has not only been introduced into the church of Rome, but sanctioned by its highest authorities, and is universally practised.

We shall only further notice the manner in which Popery has been propagated and established, as foretold by the inspired penman: "*whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.*" Deceit and guile have ever been the great instruments of Satan's working (John viii. 44; 2 Cor. xi. 3); so is it in the present instance. The words, power and signs and wonders, in the usage of the New Testament, do not refer to different things; they are used indiscriminately, or with very slight varieties of meaning, and are synonymous with miracles. Hence we learn, that the chief means to be employed in disseminating the apostasy, are pretended miracles. How this particular statement has been fulfilled throughout the whole history of Popery, we have already had occasion to notice and illustrate. As an additional exemplification of these pious frauds, and by no means an exaggerated one, there may be mentioned, on the authority of Bellarmine, the story of a hungry mare, which, though kept without food for three days, yet, when provender was set before her in the presence of the host, forgot her meat, and, bowing her head and bending her knee, adored the sacramental wafer. As a very recent illustration of the same thing, an incident may be related, which is reported on good authority, respecting the reigning

pontiff. Before leaving Naples to enter Rome, Pio Nono is said to have become calm and hopeful, because the blood of St. Januarius had liquefied twice on the same day.

It is truly humbling to be constrained to believe, that some men should be so foolish and unmanned, as to be misled in their most important affairs by such childish trifling, and such obvious knavery, and that others should be so abandoned as to invent and propagate those lying wonders. Both cases may be explained, and only in one way. We are indebted to the inspired writer for the explanation, which, while clear and satisfactory to reason, is full of the weightiest reproof to the members of the church of Rome, and of the most solemn warning to all men: "Whose coming . . . . . is with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; *because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.*"

CONCLUSION.

POPERY has now passed in review before us. Its latent, subtle, and powerful principles have been uncovered and exposed. Soon after the days of the apostles, the professing church began, as we have seen, to set aside some of God's commandments, under the idea of offering to him a more acceptable service; to ascribe an undue religious efficacy to certain bodily performances; to assign an unwarranted spiritual power to the doings of her official ministers; and to claim the privilege of being not only instituted by God, but sustained and guided in all her proceedings, however wrong, by the power and wisdom of the Most High.

The sure and gradual, yet stealthy progress of these erroneous principles has been traced. Each of them found a ready entrance, and often a cordial reception, in the half-enlightened and partially sanctified minds of the Christian community. The conflicts of the church with her external enemies, her internal divisions, and her outward prosperity, contributed, in different ways, to consolidate the growing development of evil, or to give new intensity to its power, or a fresh impulse to its advancement.

In the course of ages, the ripened fruits of those poisonous seeds of error duly appeared. The moral law was trifled with and trampled upon. Ceremonies were multiplied as far as the most slavish patience would endure, and their efficacy was magnified as much as man's perverted heart could desire. A *human priesthood* occupied such a position in the church as to fill, always and everywhere, every sinner's eye. While a self-styled infallible church, deeply stained with every impurity, overloaded to exhaustion and disfigured to burlesque with an infinitude of "beggarly elements," and leaning on the broken crutch of a sinful mortal priesthood, having sealed the book of God, and cast it on the ground, dared to set thereon an impious foot, and raise her unblushing face to heaven.

The precise state of the question between Popery and pure Christianity next occupied attention. The points which have been assailed are not the changing opinions of private members or individual doctors of the church of Rome, but the statements of her authorized documents, and the unquestioned facts of her history. We have shown that, while all the tenderness of Christian charity is to be manifested to the ignorant and inconsiderate members of that church, those who are better informed are to be judged and dealt with according to the merits of the system which they have espoused. The arguments generally employed by the modern advocates of Popery in its support, have been proved to be neither the origin of the anti-Christian apostasy, nor the means of its growth and establishment, but

instruments of defence, hastily and often disingenuously seized in a season of alarm. And, lastly, on this part of the subject, while it has been freely admitted that the desolating torrents of popish superstition are to be arrested and turned back by strong embankments of incontrovertible facts and unanswerable arguments, yet it has been found that the deep, dark fountain of the human heart whence these torrents flow, filled as it is with the mingled waters of absurdity, immorality, and impiety, can only be purified by the blood of Immanuel's sacrifice.

The argument itself was next taken up. The supreme authority of God's word has been vindicated against popish assumptions of infallibility. The prerogatives and priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ have been explained and defended in opposition to a mere human priesthood and the papal supremacy. The true and only sacrifice of Christ's atonement, and his perfect righteousness, have been exhibited in opposition to the unbloody sacrifice of the mass and the Romish treasury of merits. Unqualified and immediate justification by faith in Christ, and gradual sanctification by God's word and God's Spirit, have been unfolded and enforced in opposition to the enslaving and corrupting influence of an endless routine of ceremonial observances. And the integrity and obligation of the moral law have been asserted against the encroachments of the church of Rome, whether she be found dishonouring God with her idolatry, or misleading men by her delusions and lies, or attempt-

ing to destroy man and defy the Almighty by her barbarous, bloody, and unrelenting persecutions.

Finally, the melancholy picture of the papacy which was drawn by the finger of God himself—ere ever the foul reality had offended the Divine Majesty by opposing the gospel of Christ, and adding new bitterness to the curse of fallen men—has been exhibited, for our instruction and warning, in the light of history.

Is the reader one of those who can dispense with every form of religion, or of those whose religious form, be it Protestant or popish, hangs loosely on their person? Such individuals will think that the points in dispute have been vastly magnified, and that the zeal of the contending parties is most unreasonably excessive: they will plead that a compromise is desirable; for, to sacrifice domestic concord, or even social good-fellowship, in discussing such questions, savours more of fiery bigotry than of manly wisdom.

They forget, however, that every man must take the one side or the other in this discussion, or abjure religion altogether: they practically deny man's immortality. If man did not believe himself to be immortal, there would have been no *martyrs*, nor *inquisitors* either. Popery has exceeded all other false systems in cruelty, because of all these she has had the clearest view of eternity. All the motives that this perishing world supplies, could never have led to the atrocities of popish torture, nor sustained the priestly persecutor in his horrid occupation. This is no unauthorized fancy; for it is

written, "Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service," John xvi. 2. (See also Acts xxvi. 9—11.) Man's spiritual nature and eternal destiny, then, are clearly revealed in the flames of martyrdom; they are proclaimed by the shouts of the frenzied spectators, no less than by the groans of the dying saint. The quivering flesh of Rome's excruciated victim proves not more satisfactorily than the trembling hand of his tormentor, or the haggard features of his ghostly judge, the solemn truth that we are all hastening to a future and unending state. Where is the man, then, that does not believe in his eternity? Where the *reasonable* man that will not be controlled and governed, always and entirely, by this belief?

Our argument has certainly failed if we have not succeeded in proving that between Popery and pure Christianity there yawns an awful gulf, which can be neither spanned nor fathomed; on the one bank of which are growing the beautiful and fragrant plants of truth, love, liberty, purity, and bliss; on the other, the rank and noxious vegetation of error, envy, thraldom, vice, and misery. To deny or disregard the existence of this gulf, as is frequently done, indicates a thoroughly irreligious temper of mind. The man who, under the mask of philosophical calmness or political shrewdness, can sneer or smile at the zeal both of Romanists and of Protestants, is either far above or far below the average type of human nature. His composure seems, at first sight, to be allied either to angelic wisdom or to infernal wile. Nor is it hard to say

to which of these it more nearly approaches. When a conflict arises, on the result of which all that is dear to a man is suspended, even though the choice of a side may involve some nice considerations, cool neutrality is the lowest depth of dastard cowardice. On the broad arena of Christendom, a religious battle is now waging, and on the issue of the strife is suspended, as we have seen, all that mankind can prize in time or in eternity. To choose the wrong side, implies the most criminal ignorance, or the deepest hallucination; but to choose no side at all, or to choose a side as a stranger turns to the right or to the left on entering a church porch, is to cast vilely away the better part of humanity;—it is unutterably base.

Reader, which side have you taken? Are you a sincere and earnest Roman Catholic Christian? Then we address you as a brother-immortal, seeking the way to eternal life. Have you examined the whole subject carefully, and are you persuaded on good grounds that you are right? Doubts you must have had, if you have thought at all; have these doubts been satisfactorily resolved? Is it after forethought and deliberation that you trust the statements of your church, rather than the declarations of the word of God? Is it your intelligent conviction, that you would rather anchor your eternal prospects upon a decree of a general council, or upon a bull from the Vatican, than upon a promise of the Lord Jesus Christ? When vivid thoughts of death and eternity chase one another across your troubled mind; when the

dread day of impartial and final reckoning and judgment rises in terror and solemnity to your view; when you tremble at the wrath to come, and think with breathless anxiety of paradise and its glorious blessedness, would you rather look with confidence to the priest in the confessional, than to our great High Priest at God's right hand? Would you, when realizing such overwhelming thoughts, rather commit your body and spirit to the keeping of pope Pius the Ninth, than to the care of the glorified Son of man, who is wielding the sceptre of universal empire? Would you trust the intercession of the virgin Mary, rather than the gracious aid of God's Holy Spirit? When your conscience is bleeding with the wound of conscious guilt, whether are you likely to find the more healing balm, in a corruptible wafer, or in the blood of God's incarnate Son? When you feel yourself suspended over the brink of the bottomless pit, whether are you likely to find the stronger life-rope, in the absolution of your confessor, or in the invitation of your Redeemer? in canonical baptism, in episcopal confirmation, in death-bed unction, or in the believing prayer of your awakened, trembling soul, to Him who is the hearer of prayer, the Friend of sinners, and the Saviour of the lost,—"Lord Jesus! save me, or I perish"?

If you feel any force in these suggestions, your position, we are fully aware, is encompassed with numerous and formidable difficulties. The system with which you are connected may seem to you so complete in itself, so unerring and unchangeable,

so perfect in its religious provisions for every event in life, so ready to soothe and allay every fear of conscience, so abundant in its preparations for the future world, that to acquiesce in its claims, and remain in passive submission, offers rest and peace of a certain kind to the mind. This rest and peace, however, *you* may be now experiencing to be hollow and deceptive. But to dispute your church's claims, to question her authority, to reject her principles, and to resist her power, will involve you, you are ready to plead, in an endless controversy, and compel you to oppose the settled convictions of the society in which you move, to break up all your former associations, and expose yourself to the ridicule of your friends, the execration of your priest, and probably the sword of the magistrate.

What then?—Weigh heaven and earth—and make your choice. If God be for you, who can be against you? Let the words of him who loved you and gave himself for you be the strength of your arm and the solace of your heart: "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world," John xvi. 33. "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues," Rev. xviii. 4.

Is the reader a sincere and earnest Bible Christian? Then you cannot but be zealous. If you feel yourself to be a sinner, redeemed from the woes of hell by the blood of Jesus, your heart cannot but warm with grateful love to your Divine

Redeemer, with pure affection to your fellow-believers, and with self-denying compassion towards those that are out of the way. To suppose otherwise, were to suppose fire without heat, or salt without savour. Still, it is specially needful at this time to "exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," Jude 3.

Let your zeal be *intelligent*. It was *ignorance* conjoined with depravity that laid the strong and ample foundations of the papacy. It is also to the want of clear and accurate conceptions of Divine truth, that many of the serious mistakes of the Reformed churches must be traced. Some excuse may be urged by both parties for their imperfect knowledge. Our Protestant ancestors had to wrest the word of God from the impious grasp of spiritual despotism. Translations were slowly made, and not without many defects; printing was an infant art; the material wherewith to multiply copies, and the means of disseminating them, were costly. The sale of the Bible was often a contraband trade; and the hard-won trophy not unfrequently served only as fuel for a pontifical bonfire. In early times, similar difficulties were experienced, and often in a tenfold degree. In the numerous and important disadvantages under which our predecessors laboured, we perceive a strong palliation of their faults.

In circumstances how very different are the Protestant Christians of the nineteenth century placed on their probation! Translations of the

Scriptures have been greatly improved, and copies are multiplied in incredible numbers. The pearl of great price may be purchased for a sum that the poorest in the land regards as a trifle; and helps to understand God's word, which are legitimate and invaluable, are within reach of the great mass of the community. Little marvel if our forefathers wandered from the highway of truth; but if we, with sign-posts so many and so plain, shall lead the church into another by-way, what account shall we render to our successors, or to our God?

Study not only the Bible, but the authentic history of the church of Christ. Let not your attention be limited to the history of one section of that church; for nothing has done more to nourish sectarianism than the partial study of the past. Think not that you are well prepared to form an opinion on the leading questions of the day, till you have made some acquaintance with all the varieties of Christian development in different ages and countries, and marked the chief features of "the manifold wisdom of God" in "his wonderful works to the children of men." In these sifting times, an accurate and intimate acquaintance with Popery especially is indispensable; for unless you clearly understand *what* you are assailing, and *why* you make the assault, you may find that you are only forging a weapon for your own discomfiture.

Again, let your zeal be *impartial* and *consistent*. Contend with the principles of Popery, first, as they are developed in your own heart, and then as they are developed in your own church, and after

that, wherever else they meet you. The chemist in his laboratory, or the mathematician with his problems, may disregard the wide difference and irreconcilable opposition between Popery and pure Christianity, without introducing a flaw into his demonstrations; for this sufficient reason, that Popery is not one of the elements in the questions to be solved. But who can deny that it is an element, and a powerful element, in some of the great social questions of the present day? The hardest and most complicated knots which the science of government is now, and has long been, labouring to untie, are most obviously interwined with the scarlet of Babylon. Every attempt, therefore, to settle on a permanent basis a code of national legislation, or to fix the first principles of social order, which proceeds on the supposition that there is no gulf between Popery and pure Christianity, or that that gulf may be ignored or neglected, or that it may be crossed by liberal institutions, or by the advance of science, or by sagacious state policy, or by a pseudo-Christian charity, is self-destructive. It is an attempt to solve a problem, while overlooking one of its determining elements; as if a tyro in geometry should proceed to demonstrate the properties of a triangle, forgetting all the while that it is a plain figure with three angles.

Again, let your zeal be *pure* and *holy*. There is in many places a professed abhorrence of Popery, which is unaccompanied by a corresponding degree of real and effective opposition to its progress. This inconsistency often springs, not so much from

a mistake of the judgment, as from an inexcusable disregard of the true character of the anti-Christian system—from the want of a keen evangelical detestation of its wickedness. The heart is at fault more than the head, when the resistance made to the advances of the Man of sin is, as it too often is, not direct, but oblique; not universal, but partial; not vigorous, but noisy. Many take a one-sided view of the papacy, examining it, not from the elevated stand-point of the New Testament, but from some confined corner of their own. They measure its proportions and judge of its colours, not by the image which it reflects in the broad and perfect mirror of the Bible, but by the image which it reflects in the narrow and stained mirror of some favourite party scheme. Those who are involved in this error may be seen diverging into two parties, as rapidly as a comet in its course, and as widely as the limbs of its parabolic orbit. The one party makes a vaunted opposition to the church of Rome the cloak of secondary and secular purposes; while the other party, unable to conceal that their boasted plans fail to resist in the most direct manner the bold advances of priestly domination, supplement the deficiency by louder protestations of hostility. Both confess that their opposition should be universal and uncompromising. What moral or religious difference, then, is there between the man who sets aside or adjourns this opposition for the speedier attainment of a political end, and the man who makes this opposition the stalking-horse of worldly ambition? Both are im

molating, if not designedly, not the less really, so far as they are concerned, pure Christianity at the shrine of short-sighted expediency;—the one, with the sharp knife of orthodoxy; the other, with the glittering blade of political wisdom.

Let your zeal be *affectionate* and *self-denying*. Let everything personal give way to the extinction of popish error, and the promotion of Bible truth. "Let your love be without dissimulation." When brought in contact with any of the members of the church of Rome, let them feel that your ardour is instinct with love, and not with proselytism. Follow the example of Paul, who could honestly say, "For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more," 1 Cor. ix. 19. Let these words, "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some" (1 Cor. ix. 22), become your motto;—not in the dishonourable, crouching, vicious, impious sense given to them by the Jesuits; but in the noble, pure, and self-denying sense exemplified in the life of Paul, and illustrated still more impressively in the life of the Son of God. "Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification. For even Christ pleased not himself," Rom. xv. 2, 3.

Protestant brethren! let your hearts be, in the cause of Christ's gospel, as the heart of one man. "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" * or in the name of Luther? or of Knox? or of Wesley?

* 1 Cor. i. 13.

A cloud of *mysticism* seems to have settled down upon the reformed churches, not less dark and ominous than the one which has been described as enveloping the churches of the Nicene age. Have not Protestants been almost universally neglecting a plain and important duty, under the plea of serving God more acceptably? The first great law of the Christian church is given by our Lord himself: "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you," John xv. 12. (See also 1 John iii. 11—23.) It is, moreover, by the visible and practical manifestation of this love, that the world is to be converted. (See John xvii. 22, 23.) Who perceives not that this law is generally disregarded and transgressed? Christian concord and co-operation are unworthy of the name, if they be only partial, and not complete; wavering, and not decided; half-hearted, and not cordial. Is it not the fact, that this fundamental law of Christian union, which all admit to be possessed of the most direct and weighty obligations, and which forms the only weapon destined to be triumphantly victorious over the combined forces of ungodliness, idolatry, and Popery, is constantly set aside in almost every parish of Christendom, in professed defence of this truth and the other truth, of this and the other church privilege?

Brother Protestants! "quit you like men." "Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind *striving together* for the faith of the gospel," Phil. i. 27. The moulds in which our existing religious sects and political parties have been cast, have scarcely in

a single instance been the work of wise deliberation and holy design. They have often been the fortuitous result of circumstances, having been sometimes adopted under the pressure of strong necessity, and sometimes under the excitement of angry passions. They are too much like rafts hastily constructed by shipwrecked mariners—rough, misshapen, and sharp-angled. By clinging too tenaciously to these antiquated and perishing forms, you are hazarding, for a season, the greatest and most valuable truths of Divine revelation, and sealing the eternal ruin of some of your fellow-men. We plead for no sacrifice of truth or principle; but we do plead, by all that is reasonable, by all that is precious on earth, and all that is sacred in heaven, that the greater take precedence of the less, and such a degree of precedence as its importance and dignity demand.

Gold in itself is neither bad nor good; and it will not be affirmed, that all the gold that finds its way into the treasury of any section of the Christian church, is given to God and is acceptable to him. If in primitive times, neither eating meat offered to idols, nor abstaining from it, commended unto God (1 Cor. viii. 8); so neither in these days will any one be commended unto God by the reception, or non-reception, of government gold. But a covetous clinging to it, on the one hand, as if it were the sheet-anchor of gospel ordinances, and a morbid dread of it, on the other hand, as if it were the chief rock or quicksand which the church has at present to fear, are more

than enough, especially when developed together and in opposition to each other, to bring defeat and disgrace, for a time, upon the cause of pure Christianity.

Oh! for an angel's arm to raise aloft, in these last perilous times, the broad banner of the gospel, and for a seraph's voice to rally around it the conflicting and distracted tribes of Israel! Must it still be, that right-minded Christian men, on whose hearts has been shed abroad the love of Christ, will continue to endanger the ark of the Lord, by waving their little sectarian flags, and shouting their petty shibboleths? On such there lies a dread responsibility.

Disciples of the Crucified! "watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, *be strong*," 1 Cor. xvi. 13. He is not prepared at all, who is not prepared for the worst. Have you abjured the service of "the rulers of the darkness of this world," and enrolled yourselves under the standard of "the Prince of life"? Then you have engaged yourselves not only in the noblest, but also in the hardest warfare. If we are not called upon to anticipate, distinctly and personally, a bloody future, neither dare we dismiss the anticipation, nor forget the bloody past. The trumpet of inspiration is giving no uncertain sound: "For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober," 1 Thess. v. 2, 6. Romish priestcraft can float smoothly on the tide of democracy, or ride proudly on the

billows of revolution, or direct, unseen, the storm of despotic tyranny. And even at this very hour is she practising all her arts in our own and other lands, according to the social and political condition of each. The battle, then, is before you; as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, be prepared to endure hardness.

"Dream not that the way is smooth,
Hope not that the thorns are roses;
Turn no wishful eye of youth
Where the sunny beam reposes:—
Thou hast sterner work to do,
Hosts to cut thy passage through:
Close behind thee gulfs are burning,–
Forward!—there is no returning!"

The Captain of our salvation is himself moving through the Christian hosts, which He is gathering together to "set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (Dan. ii. 44), and is giving the signal in words which have been familiar to his followers in all generations,—the universal battle-cry of all who fight the good fight of faith,—"Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple," Luke xiv. 33. *Less than the simple-hearted reception of this statement will carry no man to heaven; more than its simple-hearted reception is not needed to carry any one to the stake.*

APPENDIX.

A. Page 35.

"Quantum detrahant fidei, quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiæ secundæ, disciplina ecclesiæ et præscriptio apostoli declarat, cum digamos non sinit præsidere, cum viduam adlegi in ordinem nisi univiram non concedit, aram enim Dei mundam proponi oportet."—Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem*, p. 186. Lutetiæ, 1641.

B. Page 41.

"*Οὐ φοβῇ, οὐκ ἐρυθριᾷς κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν φοβερὰν ὥραν ψεύστης εὑρισκομενου; βαβαὶ τοῦ θαύματος. της τραπέζης της μυστικῆς ἐξηρτισμένης, τοῦ ἀμνου τοῦ θεου ὑπὲρ σου σφραγιαζομένου, τοῦ ἱερέως ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἀγωνιζομένου, πυρὸς πνευματικου ἐκ τοῦ ἀχράντου ἀναβλυζοντος τραπεζης, τῶν χερουβὶμ περισταμένων, καὶ τῶν σεραφὶμ ἱπταμένων, τῶν ἐξαπτερύγων τὰ πρόσωπα κατακαλυπτόντων, πασῶν τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων μετὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ὑπὲρ σου πρεσβευουσων. . . . . μὴ ὅτι ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἴδῃς, μηδὲ ὅτι οἶνός ἐστι νομίσῃς. οὐ γὰρ ὡς αἱ λοιπαὶ βρώσεις εἰς ἀφεδρωνα χωρει ἄπαγε, μὴ τουτο νόει. αλλ' ὥσπερ κηρος πυρὶ προσομιλήσας οὐδὲν ἀπουσιάζει, οὐδεν περισεύει. οὕτω καὶ ὧδε νόμιζε συναναλίσκεσθαι τὰ μυστήρια τῇ τοῦ σώματος οὐσίᾳ. διὸ καὶ προσερχόμενοι, μὴ ὡς ἐξ ἀνθρώπου νομίσητε μεταλαμβάνειν τοῦ θείου σώματος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν σεραφὶμ τῇ λαπίδι τοῦ πυρὸς, ἥν περ Ησαίας εἶδε.*"—Chrysostom, *DI Pœnitentia*, Homil. ix. tom. ii. pp. 349, 350. Parisiis, 1718.

C. Pages 68, 69.

"Sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Romanam ecclesiam omnium ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco; Romanoque pontifici, beati Petri, apostolorum principis successori ac Jesu Christi vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro. Hanc veram catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in

præsenti sponte profiteor et veraciter teneo, eandem integram et immaculatam usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum constantissime (Deo adjuvante) retinere et confiteri, atque a meis subditis, vel illis, quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri et prædicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem N. spondeo, voveo ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc sancta Dei evangelia."—*Bulla S. D. N. D. Pii, Divina Providentia Papæ Quarti, super forma juramenti professionis fidei.—Can. et Dec. Concilii Tridentini*, p. 228. Lipsiæ, 1846.

"Jura, honores, privilegia, et auctoritatem sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, Domini nostri Papæ et successorum prædictorum, conservare, defendere, augere, promovere curabo. Neque ero in consilio, vel facto, seu tractatu, in quibus contra ipsum Dominum nostrum, vel eandem Romanam ecclesiam aliqua sinistra, vel præjudicialia personarum juris, honoris, status, et potestatis eorum machinentur. Et si talia a quibuscunque tractari, vel procurari novero, impediam hoc pro posse, et quanto citius potero, significabo eidem Domino nostro, vel alteri, per quem possit ad ipsius notitiam pervenire."—*Pontificale Romanum Clementis* VIII., *Pont. Max., jussu restitutum atque, editum*, p. 46. Folio. Parisiis, 1615.

D. Pages 71, 72

செத்தநாய்புமுத்து நாறிமூளத்தபுமுவே
புலகமியாவையும் விளக்கத்தகுஞசூ-
ரியனென்று நினைக்கினுஞ் சகலபா-
வங்களிலேபிறந்து மூளத்ததப்பறையீ-
டேற்றத்துக்குரியவேதமென்று கருதவுந்-
தகுமோ வேதவிளக்கம். ப். கூ.

E. Pages 82, 83.

"Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto et amplector. Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum scripturarum, admitto, nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum patrum accipiam et interpretabor. Cetera item omnia a sacris canonibus et œcumenicis conciliis, ac præcipue à sacrosanctâ Tridentinâ synodo

tradita, definita et declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor, simulque contraria omnia, atque hæreses quascunque ab ecclesia damnatas et rejectas, et anathematizatas ego pariter damno, rejicio et anathematizo."—*Can. et Dec. Conc. Trid.* pp. 227, 228.—*Bulla S. D. N. D. Pii, Divina Providentia Papæ Quarti, super forma juramenti prof. fid.*

"Sed quemadmodum hæc una ecclesia errare non potest in fidei ac morum disciplina tradenda, quum a Spiritu sancto gubernetur: ita ceteras omnes, quæ sibi ecclesiæ nomen arrogant, ut quæ diaboli spiritu ducantur, in doctrinæ et morum perniciosissimis erroribus versari necesse est."—*Catechismus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini*, p. 85, Pars i. cap. x. q. 16. Lipsiæ, 1847.

F. Page 93.

"Pro gemmis et serico divinos codices amet, in quibus non auri et pellis Babylonicæ vermiculata pictura; sed ad fidem placeat emendata et erudita distinctio. Discat primo Psalterium, his se canticis avocet; et in Proverbiis Salomonis erudiatur ad vitam. In Ecclesiaste, consuescat, quæ mundi sunt, calcare. In Job, virtutis et patientiæ exempla sectetur. Ad Evangelia transeat, numquam ea positura de manibus."—*Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Operum*. Epist. cvii. sec. xii. Venetiis, 1766.

"Tu noli dulcedine præteritæ vitæ obsurdescere adversus verbum Dei: noli præsentibus rebus sic teneri et impediri, ut dicas, non mihi vacat legere, non mihi vacat audire."—Augustine in *Psalm* lxvi. sec. 10.

G. Page 93.

"Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῶν πενεστέρων πολλοὺς οἶμαι κατακεχρῆσθαι αὐτῇ συνεχῶς, ἐκεινο ἂν ἡδέως ἐροίμην αὐτοὺς, εἰ μὴ πάντα τὰ της τεχνης ὄργανα, ἧς ἕκαστός ἐστι δημιουργὸς, πλήρη καὶ ὁλόκληρα ἔχει, κἂν μυρία κωλύει πενία; πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄτοπον, ἐκει μὲν μὴ αἰτιᾶσθαι πενίαν, ἀλλὰ πάντα πράττειν πρὸς τὸ μηδὲν γενέσθαι ἐμπόδιον μηδαμόθεν μέλλοντας δὲ τοσαύτην ὠφέλειαν καρποῦσθαι, ἀσχολίαν ἀποδύρεσθαι καὶ πενίαν."—Chrysostom, Hom. xi. in *Johan.* Sec. i. tom. viii. p. 63. Parisiis, 1718.

H. Page 103.

"Schismatici, ii etiam qui non errarent in doctrina, solo schismatis sui facto excluduntur ab ecclesia, et sunt extra viam

salutis."—*Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi.* By De la Hogue. Cap. ii. Pars ii. q. i. prop. 2. Dublinii, 1829.

I. Pages 103, 104.

"Subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."—*Corpus Juris Canonici, Gregorii XIII.* Jussu editum. Tom. ii. extrav. lib. i. tit. viii. cap. 1. Lugduni, 1661.

The above has been sanctioned by the fifth Lateran Council; and, as the point is of some importance, we adduce the evidence:—"Et cum de necessitate salutis existat omnes Christi fideles Romano pontifici subesse prout Divinæ Scripturæ et sanctorum patrum testimonio edocemur, ac constitutione felicis memoriæ Bonifacii Papæ VIII., similiter prædecessoris nostri, quæ incipit, unam sanctam, declaratur: pro eorumdem fidelium animarum salute, ac Romani pontificis et hujus sanctæ sedis supremâ auctoritate, et ecclesiæ sponsæ suæ unitate et potestate, constitutionem ipsam sacro præsente concilio approbante, innovamus et approbamus."—*Concilium Lateranense* v. Sess. xi.—*Labbei et Cosartii Conc.* Tom. xix. col. 968, E. Venetiis, 1733.

K. Pages 110, 111.

"Neque enim aliter accipienda est vox sacerdotis peccata nobis legitime condonantis, quam Christi Domini, qui ait paralytico. 'Confide fili, remittuntur tibi peccata tua.'" "Pænitens sacerdotis judicio, ut qui Dei personam gerit, se subjiciat necesse est, ut pro scelerum magnitudine pænam constituere in eum possit.'"—*Catech. Conc. Trid.* Pars ii. cap. v. q. 10 et q. 22.

"Sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem existere, et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi, et gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in actis œcumenicorum conciliorum, et in sacris canonibus continetur."—*Concilium Florentinum. Definitio, Labb.* Tom. xviii. col. 527, A. Venetiis, 1733.

"Satis evidenter ostenditur, à seculari potestate nec ligari

prorsus nec solvi posse pontificem (quem constat a pio principe Constantino Deum esse appellatum), nec posse Deum ab hominibus judicari manifestum est."—*Corpus Juris Canonici, Gratiani Decretum.* Prima Pars. dist. xcvi. c. vii.

L. Page 119.

"Tu enim pastor, tu medicus, tu gubernator, tu cultor, tu denique alter Deus in terris."—*Lateran. Conc.* v. Sess. iv. *Labb.* Tom. xix. col. 761, D. Venetiis, 1733.

M. Page 130.

"Accipe tiaram tribus coronis ornatam, et scias te esse patrem principum et regum, rectorem orbis in terra vicarium Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi: cui est honor et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen."—*Pio* v., *Pont. Max.*, *Pontificale Romanum*, p. 45. Venetiis, 1572.

N. Pages 134, 135.

"Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramento contineri vere, realiter et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum; sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in signo, vel figura, aut virtute: anathema sit."—*Conc. Trident.* Sess. xiii. can. 1.

"Si quis dixerit, in missa non offerri Deo verum, et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari: anathema sit."—*Ibid.* Sess. xxii. can. 1.

"Si quis dixerit, illis verbis: 'hoc facite in meam commemorationem,' Christum non instituisse apostolos sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi aliique sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem suum: anathema sit."—*Ibid.* Can. 2.

"Si quis dixerit, in sancto eucharistiæ sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latriæ, etiam externo, adorandum, atque ideo nec festiva peculiari celebritate venerandum, neque in processionibus secundum laudabilem et universalem ecclesiæ sanctæ ritum et consuetudinem solemniter circumgestandum, vel non publice, ut adoretur, populo proponendum, et ejus adoratores esse idololatras: anathema sit."—*Ibid.* Sess. xiii. can. 6.

O. Page 143.

"Suscipe sancte Pater, omnipotens æterne Deus, hanc immaculatam Hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deo meo vivo et vero, pro innumerabilibus peccatis et offensionibus et negligentiis meis, et pro omnibus circumstantibus, sed et pro omnibus fidelibus Christianis vivis atque defunctis : ut mihi et illis proficiat ad salutem in vitam æternam. Amen."—*Missale Romanum, ex Decreto Sac. Conc. Trid. Restitutum S. Pii Quinti*, p. 194. *Jussu editum.* Mechliniæ, 1840.

P. Pages 149, 150.

"Prolatis verbis consecrationis, statim Hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat; surgit, ostendit populo, reponit super corporale, iterum adorat."—*Ibid.* p. 236.

Q. Pages 155, 156.

"Ad consummationem salutaris de justificatione doctrinæ, quæ in præcedenti proxima sessione uno omnium Patrum consensu promulgata fuit, consentaneum visum est de sanctissimis ecclesiæ sacramentis agere, per quæ omnis vera justitia vel incipit, vel cœpta augetur, vel amissa reparatur."—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. vii. Proæm.

"Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non esse ad salutem necessaria, sed superflua, et sine eis aut eorum voto per solam fidem homines a Deo gratiam justificationis adipisci, licet omnia singulis necessaria non sint: anathema sit."—*Ibid.* Can. 4.

"Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere: anathema sit."—*Ibid.* Can. 8.

R. Page 166.

"Neque potest certus esse certitudine fidei, se percipere verum sacramentum, cùm sacramentum sine intentione ministri non conficiatur, et intentionem alterius nemo videre possit."—Bellarmine, *De Justificatione.* Lib. iii. cap. 8. *Coloniæ Agrippinæ.* Tom. iv. col. 964, B. 1619.

S. Page 182.

"Constanter teneo sanctos una cum Christo regnantes venerandos atque invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas. Firmiter assero, imagines Christi ac deiparæ semper Virginis, nec non aliorum sanctorum, habendas et retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam."—*Bulla super Form. Jur. Fid.*

T. Page 185.

"*Τάχα πολὺς ὑμῖν ἐγενετο πόθος τῶν ἁγìων ἐκείνων· μετὰ τούτου τοίννν τοῦ πυρὸς προσπέσωμεν αὐτῶν τοῖς λειψάνοις· συμπλακῶμεν αὐτῶν ταῖς θήκαις· δύνανται γὰρ καὶ θῆκαι μαρτύρων πολλὴν ἔχειν δύναμιν, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν μαρτύρων πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ἰσχύν. Καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἑορτῆς ταύτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἑτέραις ἡμέραις προσεδρεύωμεν αὐταῖς, παρακαλῶμεν αὐτὰς, ἀξιῶμεν γενέσθαι προστάτιδας ἡμῶν· πολλὴν γὰρ ἔχουσι παῤῥησίαν οὐχὶ ζῶσαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τελευτήσασαι· καὶ πολλῷ μᾶλλον τελευτήσασαι. Νῦν γὰρ τὰ στίγματα φέρουσι τοῦ χριστοῦ· τὰδὲ στίγματα ἐπιδεικνύμεναι ταῦτα, πάντα δύνανται πεῖσαι τὸν βασιλέα· Ἐπει οὖν τοσαύτη ἡ δύναμις αὐταῖς καὶ ἡ φιλία πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, τῇ συνεχεῖ προσεδρίᾳ καὶ τῇ διηνεκεῖ πρὸς αὐτὰς ἀφίξει καταστήσαντες ἑαυ τοὺς οἰκείους αὐτῶν, ἐπισπασώμεθα δι' αὐτῶν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν.*"
—Chrysostom. Tom. ii. p. 645. Parisiis, 1718.

U. Page 196.

"Juramentum contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam præstitum, non tenet."—*Corpus Jur. Can.* Tom. ii. *Decret. Gregory* IX. Lib. ii. tit. xxiv. cap. xxvii.

"Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta, sed potius perjuria, quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta."—*Conc. Later.* iii. Can. 16. *Labb. Conc.* Tom. xiii. col. 426, B. Venetiis, 1733.

X. Page 198.

"Obj. obligatio juramenti est juris naturalis et divini, ergo illa cessare non potest per dispensationem, commutationem vel irritationem.

"R: neg. cons. quia per dispensationem, etc., efficitur, 'ut id, quod sub juramento cadebat, sub juramento non cadat subtrahendo, prohibendo, etc., et ita non fit aliquid contra juramentum.' (S. Th. 2. 2. q. 89. a. 9. ad. 1.) Deinde omni juramento inest hæc conditio: 'salvo jure superioris.'"—Dens' *Theology*, Tom. iv. (*De Juramento*, No. 177) p. 216.

Y. Page 210.

"Hæreticos, schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Domino nostro, vel successoribus prædictis, pro posse persequar et impugnabo."—*Pontificale Romanum*, p. 46. Parisiis, 1615.

Z. Page 233.

"Dei et papæ consistorium idem est, sicut episcopi et ejus vicarii; ideo nullum majus tribunal in terris invenitur."—*Apologia Eugenii Papæ* IV. *in Concilio Florentino ad Basileenses*, No. xlviii. *Labb.* tom. xviii. col. 1430. Venetiis, 1733.

"Fides catholica docet, omnem virtutem esse bonam, omne vitium esse malum; si autem papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes teneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare."—Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*. Lib. iv. cap. v. tom. i. col. 815, B.

A A. Page 234.

"Quasi in te, uno vero atque legitimo Christi et Dei vicario, propheticum illud debuerit rursus impleri: *Adorabunt eum omnes reges terræ, omnes gentes servient ei.*"—*Lateran. Conc.* v. Sess. vii. *Labb. et Cosart. Concilia.* Tom. xix. col. 892, B. Venetiis, 1732.

Reed and Pardon, Printers, Paternoster Row, London.

WORKS ON ROMANISM,

PUBLISHED BY

THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY,

56, PATERNOSTER ROW.

Prize Essay on Romanism.

THE HEAD AND THE HEART ENLISTED AGAINST ROMANISM UNDER THE BANNER OF CHRISTIAN TRUTH.

Being the Essay to which has been awarded the sum of TWENTY GUINEAS, offered by the Religious Tract Society for the best Treatise on the Errors of Romanism, addressed to Teachers and Scholars. 18mo. With Engraving. 1*s*. cloth boards.

LUTHER:

HIS MENTAL AND SPIRITUAL HISTORY;

With Special Reference to its Earlier Periods, and the Opening Scenes of the Reformation.

By BARNAS SEARS, D.D.

12mo. With Portrait of Luther. 4*s*. boards.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

By J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D.D.

Carefully revised by the Author, who has also made various Additions not hitherto published. Copyright Edition, printed by Messrs. Oliver and Boyd. In four volumes. Vols. I., II., III., 3*s*. each volume, in neat cloth boards; vol. IV., 5*s*.

In demy 8vo, the Four vols. in One, with Autograph of Author. 6*s*. in cloth boards; or, in 2 vols., 7*s*.

PAPAL ERRORS:

THEIR RISE AND PROGRESS.

18mo. 2*s*. cloth boards.

THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS A SAFE WAY TO SALVATION.

By William Chillingworth, M.A.

2 vols. 18mo, 5*s*. boards; 7*s*. half-bound.

THE GOSPEL LEVER APPLIED TO THE OVER-TURNING OF ROMANISM.

By the Rev. E. Nangle, B.A.

18mo, 1*s*. boards; 1*s*. 6*d*. half-bound.

POPERY UNVEILED.

IN SIX LECTURES.

18mo edition, 1*s*. 6*d*. boards; 2*s*. half-bound. 32mo edition, 1*s*. boards.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

An Account of the Proceedings of that Assembly, illustrating the Spirit and Tendency of Popery. 18mo, 1*s.* 6*d.* boards; 2*s.* half-bound.

DIALOGUE BETWEEN A POPISH PRIEST AND AN ENGLISH PROTESTANT.

By M. Poole.

18mo, 1*s.* 6*d.* boards; 2*s.* half-bound.

LUCILLA;

OR,

THE READING OF THE BIBLE.

By Adolphe Monod.

Translated from the French. 32mo, 1*s.* 4*d.* boards.

POPULAR ROMANISM EXAMINED.

32mo, 1*s.* boards; 1*s.* 4*d.* half-bound.

M'GAVIN ON "THE END OF CONTROVERSY."

Being Strictures on Dr. Milner's Work in Support of Popish Errors, entitled "The End of Religious Controversy." Royal 32mo. 1*s.* 6*d.* boards.

SKETCH OF POPERY.

Royal 32mo. 1*s.* 6*d.* boards.

THE REFORMATION IN EUROPE.

By the Author of "The Council of Trent."

18mo, 2*s.* 6*d.* boards; 3*s.* 6*d.* half-bound.

THE BENEFIT OF CHRIST'S DEATH.

From the Italian of Aonio Paleario. With Introduction by Rev. J. Ayre, Chaplain to the Earl of Roden.

1*s.* 6*d.* cloth boards.

LIFE OF RAMON MONSALVATGE;

A CONVERTED SPANISH MONK.

1*s.* cloth; 1*s.* 6*d.* half-bound.

THE WILL-FORGERS;

OR,

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

By the Rev. C. B. Tayler.

1*s.* cloth.

THE SPIRIT OF POPERY.

An Exposure of its Origin, Character, and Results. In Letters from a Father to his Children. With Embellishments. 16mo square, 4*s.* 6*d.* cloth, gilt edges.

THE FOOTPRINTS OF POPERY;

OR,

PLACES WHERE THE MARTYRS HAVE SUFFERED.

With Engravings. Intended for the Young. 18mo, 1*s.* cloth; 2*s.* half-bound.

THE LOLLARDS;

OR,

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE WITNESSES OF THE TRUTH IN ENGLAND, BETWEEN 1400 AND 1546.

Superior Engravings on Wood. 12mo, 3*s*. boards; 4*s*. half-bound.

THE DAYS OF QUEEN MARY;

CONTAINING AN ACCOUNT OF THE RESTORATION OF ROMANISM, AND THE SUFFERINGS OF THE MARTYRS.

12mo, 3*s*. boards; 4*s*. half-bound.

LIVES OF THE BRITISH REFORMERS,

FROM WYCLIFFE TO FOX.

18mo, 3*s*. boards; 4*s*. half-bound. Royal Edition, with 12 Portraits, 6*s*. boards.

18*mo*, *in Stiff Covers*, 4*d*. *each*.

Anecdotes of Fontainebleau; with an Introduction by the Rev. DANIEL WILSON, M.A. 6*d*. fancy cover.

Blind Celestine of Paturages.

Flight of the Camisards. A Story for the Young. By the Rev. C. G. BARTH, D.D. Translated from the German.

Gossner's Primitive Christianity; or, The Ancient Catholic Faith of Apostolic Christians.

Luther, Brief Sketch of the Life of, with a few Extracts from his Writings.

Pagan Rome. Translated from the French, by the Rev. T. Pyne.

Papal Persecution in France; or, Memoirs of Marolles and Lefevre, two French Protestants.

Popery Unchanged; or, Persecutions at Salzburg.

Sander's Watchword of the Reformers—"The Lord our Righteousness."

William; or, The Converted Romanist. Translated from the French.

Broadsheets, at 1s. 4d. per Quire, containing 24.— "Protestant Truths and Romish Errors." "The Protestant Reformation." "Days of Queen Mary." "The Lollards."

A large variety of Tracts, from 4 pp. and upwards, on "The Errors of Popery," which may be had either separately, or in Packets containing a Selection, 1*s.* each.

BSB Bayerische StaatsBibliothek
MDZ Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum Digitale Bibliothek

The Gospel and the great Apostasy; or, Popery contrasted with pure Christianity, in the light of history and scripture

London (1852)

Polem. 1164 h
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10773916-2